Aff Answers Spending DA

Uniqueness Level

New Spending Now

Non – Unique - The Treasury is accelerating government spending

Cagahastian 7/8 (David Cagahastian, writer, 7/8/14, "Treasury claims to have accelerated government spending in June," Business Mirror, http://businessmirror.com.ph/index.php/en/news/top-news/35134-treasury-claims-to-have-accelerated-government-spending-in-june, Accessed 7/12/14, MX)

The government on Tuesday **claimed to have accelerated its spending** activities in June by an undetermined amount, the event happening months after a slowdown in the disbursement of funds that enabled it to post a surplus in May instead. **This is significant in that the government is supposed to have engaged in a fiscal stimulus program that has yet to find fulfillment in a year when local output**, measured as the gross domestic product (GDP), came out lower than expected and seen by some to disappoint, even the most conservative analyst. National Treasurer Rosalia de Leon said there had been an uptick in the expenditures in June, based on initial figures compiled by the Bureau of the Treasury. "For June, what we've seen is that there's an acceleration in the disbursement program. There are no final numbers yet but there will be an improvement in terms of expenditures, although the deficit will still be within the program," de Leon said. The latter pertains to the deliberately crafted program to spend far more than government expects to generate from its collection activities and for this deficit to act as stimulus for accelerated growth. **This fiscal imbalance or deficit was programmed to equal at least 2 percent of GDP. Figures from the Department of Finance (DOF) show the government posting an P11.8-billion surplus in May, or the five-month balance as budget excess totaling P8.5 billion.** The DOF said the surplus position was due to buoyant revenue collection even as spending also slowed slightly during the January-to-May period. De Leon said the slowdown in spending, which some analysts believe could affect economic growth because government spending is a key growth driver, could be because of the decreased need to disburse money in areas affected by Supertyphoon Yolanda which hit the country late last year. **For the period January-to-May, government spending still increased by 5 percent from disbursement figures reported for the period in 2013. As of end-May, the government already spent P786.6 billion compared to P747.27 billion disbursed over five months by the government in 2013. Revenue collections from January to May 2014 were up to P795.1 billion, with the Bureau of Internal Revenue collecting the most with P549.1 billion for the five-month period.**

The government is going to go on a spending spree between now and September

Carrol 7/7 (Rebecca Carroll, Senior Correspondent; BA from University of Pennsylvania, 7/7/14, "Why the Government Is Probably about to Go on a Spending Spree," Nextgov, http://www.nextgov.com/cio-briefing/2014/07/why-government-probably-about-go-spending-spree/88039/, Accessed 7/12/14, MX)

Agencies will make 35.4 percent of their 2014 purchases between this month and the end of the fiscal year on Sept. 30, with most of that activity occurring in September, Deltek predicted. **In a typical recent year, 32.4 percent of all spending took place in the fourth quarter, and 18 percent occurred in September alone**, Deltek found. **The numbers are even higher for specific procurement types and at certain agencies. For instance, in the last five years, 39 percent of government information technology purchases were made in the fourth quarter.** "Agencies can hold off on software and IT equipment upgrades," Carey Webster, Deltek's director of federal information solutions, explained in a webinar. "At the same time, it's very easy to procure these types of services quickly when there is money to burn." Large aerospace and defense acquisitions that take years to procure are less likely to take place quickly at the end of the year, which is why the Energy and Defense departments and NASA are the agencies least

prone to balloon spending in the final quarter, as a percentage of their overall spending. **The State Department, meanwhile, makes more than half of its purchases -- 56 percent -- in the fourth quarter**. Researchers didn't know why this was the case; they checked for an anomalous year that may have thrown off the average, but **larger fourth-quarter spending has been the norm at the department for the last five years**, at least, Webster said. The departments of Interior and Health and Human Service and the U.S. Agency for International Development were the next most likely to save their purchases for the last quarter, spending an average of 47 percent, 46 percent and 44 percent of their contracting budgets at the yearend, respectively. **Deltek based its analysis on this year's enacted discretionary budget of $1,127 billion. In recent years, about 43 percent of the discretionary budget is contracted, the analysis found. Assuming the pattern holds this year, about $489.5 billion will have gone to contractors by the end of September. Because the year started off slow -- only about 17** percent of estimated expenditures were contracted out in the first quarter -- **Deltek expects federal outlays of about $168.2 billion this quarter, or 35.4 percent.**

Government spending remains high

Hood 7/1 (John Hood, President and Chairman of the John Locke Foundation President and Chairman of the John Locke Foundation, 7/1/14, "John Hood: Government spending remains high," The Durhan News, http://www.thedurhamnews.com/2014/07/01/3975884/john-hood-government-spending.html, Accessed 7/13/14, MX)

Total state spending adjusted for inflation and population growth reached its highest point in 2011-12, at about $5,350 per person. It has declined slightly since then, primarily because of lower recession-related federal funding, but **remains well over $5,000. That's higher than any year before 2012**, and about double what North Carolina spent as recently as the late 1980s.

Government spending high now

Bilmes 2/5 (Linda Bilmes, Daniel Patrick Moynihan Senior Lecturer in Public Policy, 2/5/14, "Reforming the Budget: Four Steps to Restore Fiscal Discipline," Brookings, http://www.brookings.edu/blogs/fixgov/posts/2014/02/04-budget-reform-accounting-system-overhead-bilmes, Accessed 7/13/14, MX)

America's dysfunctional budget process **has been mired in federal shutdowns and debt ceiling brinksmanship** for the past several years. No wonder citizens' confidence in government is at its lowest in four decades. Conventional wisdom in Washington is that hyper-partisanship has infected appropriations along with everything else, and that barring a dramatic shift in political tone, the best we can do is to pass one-off deals such as the recent Ryan-Murray bill. But there are a series of structural reforms that could substantially improve the way the US does budgeting, and which could be enacted by a bipartisan majority dedicated to good government. **The current budget system is broken: it consumes far too much time for little gain. Every year,** thousands of **officials** across government **prepare** detailed **estimates of how much it will cost** to run their organizations, **which Congress** mostly **ignores**. **Instead, we enact budgets based on the previous year's spending—not based on true need**, shifting priorities or changing realities. As a result, Congress has enacted 75 stopgap "continuing resolutions" during the past decade. In an effort **to illustrate value, federal agencies** also **conduct** an elaborate **annual process to evaluate how well they are performing, but** these **assessments have almost no impact on Congress**ional appropriations. Meanwhile, **Congress has spent trillions for the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan using more than 30 such "emergency supplemental" bills, which circumvent normal budget caps and scrutiny.** Even **worse, we can't keep track of where the money goes. Federal accounting systems provide little management information and are completely unsuited to rooting out overhead,**

duplication and inefficiencies. Most agency budgets are simply long itemized lists of salaries and expenses. There is no mechanism for calculating costs by the type of service delivered, and no way for managers to obtain such information. The process lags far behind many local governments, which break down their spending into "program budgeting"–providing much greater transparency over expenses, costs and overheads at each stage in the process. **The lack of functional budgeting and accounting has lowered the quality, and increased the cost of federal government services. Agencies are unsure how much money they will have for next year, or even next month**. A recent study by Philip **Joyce** of the University of Maryland **showed that such funding delays result in a series of inefficiencies**. **Agencies pay higher prices than necessary to hire contractors because the government needs to use short-term contracts. Agencies too often delay maintenance, leading to higher costs in the future** and significant harm to employee morale, retention, hiring and training. In a separate study, my Harvard colleague Jeffrey **Liebman found that federal agency spending spikes in the 52nd week of the fiscal year,** and unsurprisingly, **much of that spending goes to lower-quality items.**

Spending high now – its being masked by tax collections

Manning, Vice president of public policy and communications for Americans for Limited Government, **14**

(Rick, Public Affairs Chief of Staff at the U.S. Department of Labor during the George W. Bush Administration, and has worked in numerous grassroots and political communications roles, most notably, as a state lobbyist for the National Rifle Association for nine years, 6/18/14, "Federal revenues and spending rise but no balanced budget", http://netrightdaily.com/2014/06/federal-revenues-spending-rise-balanced-budget/, AL)

The federal **government released the** good **news that revenue collections have reached an all-time high** with total receipts of $1.935 trillion from October 1, 2013 to the end of May. The federal government projects that total federal government revenues for **the entire year will reach** just slightly more than **$3 trillion.¶** Yet, even with this unprecedented flow of cash into the nation's Treasury, the October-May deficit is an astounding $436 billion with May's deficit alone totaling almost $130 billion.¶ The problem is that the record revenue flows are largely driven by growth inhibiting tax increases and the restoration of the payroll tax after a short-term stimulus cut. Yet, rather than holding the spending line so revenues could catch up with spending, **the federal government is projected to spend $3.65 trillion for the year, more than ever in history.¶** In fact, federal **spending** in this fiscal year **is jumping by almost $200 billion according to Treasury Department projections.**

Year	Receipts	Outlays	Surplus or Deficit (-)
2009	2,104,989	3,517,677	-1,412,688
2010	2,162,706	3,457,079	-1,294,373
2011	2,303,466	3,603,059	-1,299,593
2012	2,450,164	3,537,127	-1,086,963
2013	2,775,103	3,454,605	-679,502
2014 estimate	3,001,721	3,650,526	-648,805
2015 estimate	3,337,425	3,900,989	-563,564
2016 estimate	3,567,952	4,099,078	-531,126
2017 estimate	3,810,779	4,268,606	-457,827
2018 estimate	4,029,856	4,443,145	-413,289
2019 estimate	4,226,119	4,728,791	-502,672

With almost two/thirds of all federal government spending on automatic pilot, the above chart shows the mushrooming growth of outlays even with receipts projected to double from 2009 to

2019.¶ If the projected increase in federal government expenditures only rise by 2 percent over the next two years rather than the current 9.3 percent rise, and the receipts remained as projected, the deficit would be reduced to $256 billion in just those two years. **Incredibly**, this two percent increase in federal government spen**ding over the next two years would lower the increase in the national debt by more than half a trillion dollars over that time**.

NonUQ – billions spent on climate change activities now

Clabough, Marketing Assistant at Job Corps, Writer at The New American, **13**
(Raven, 10/30/13, "Government to spend twice as much on global warming than border security", http://www.thenewamerican.com/usnews/politics/item/16836-govt-to-spend-twice-as-much-on-global-warming-than-border-security, AL)

Estimates reveal that **the** federal **government will spend more money on** fighting **global warming than** it will on **tightening border security. Global-warming spending is estimated to cost** approximately $**22.2 billion** this year, **twice as much as the $12 billion** estimated **for** customs and **border enforcement**.¶ According to the White House, **there are currently 18 federal agencies engaged in** activities related to global **warming**. Those agencies fund programs that **include** scientific **research**, international **climate assistance, renewable** energy **technology, and subsidies for renewable energy producers.**¶ Republicans have criticized the administration for its global-warming efforts and have demanded more transparency. The online Daily Caller reported, "Republicans on the Energy and Commerce Committee have been calling on the heads of major federal agencies to testify on global warming activities."¶ The efforts to acquire testimony have been mostly unsuccessful, however, with just the heads of the Energy Department and Environmental Protection Agency agreeing to testify in front of the House of Representatives.¶ "**With billions** of dollars **currently being spent annually on climate change activities**, Congress and **the public should understand** the scope of **what the** federal **government is doing**, how the billions of dollars are being spent, and what it will accomplish," said Kentucky Republican Rep. Ed Whitfield. "Anyone who believes the committee ought to be focusing its attention on climate change related issues should be standing with us to get these answers."

NonUQ- spending increasing

Dorfman, professor of economics at The University of Georgia, consultant on economic issues to a variety of corporations and local governments, author of Ending the Era of the Free Lunch, Contributor at Forbes, **14**
(3/6/14, "The federal reserve is enabling Obama and Congress' Out of control spending", http://www.forbes.com/sites/jeffreydorfman/2014/03/06/the-federal-reserve-is-enabling-obama-and-congress-out-of-control-spending/, AL)

In the past **twelve months the** federal **government** has **increased the national debt** held by the public by $**697 billion while the total debt has grown by $820 billion**. Since revenue collected by the government is at record highs, these enormous **deficits must be due to spending**. Among the **many** extraordinary **measures** taken by the Federal Reserve over the past five or so years are several that **are serving to enable** President Obama and **Congress** in continuing **to spend with little**, if any, **restraint**. If we hope to get spending under control, it would help if the Fed stopped encouraging so much wasteful spending.

Lavish spending now

Boccia, Grover M. Hermann Fellow in Federal Budgetary Affairs,Thomas A. Roe Institute for Economic Policy Studies, The Institute for Economic Freedom and Opportunity at The Heritage Foundation, **Fraser**, Heritage Expert, **and Goff**, Policy analyst, transportation and infrastructure, Thomas A Roe for Economic Policy Studies **13**
(Romina, Alison, Emily, "Federal spending by the numbers, 2013: Government spending trends in graphics, tables, and key points", http://www.heritage.org/research/reports/2013/08/federal-spending-by-the-numbers-2013, AL)

Obamacare will add $1.8 trillion to federal health care spending **by 2023. By 2015, health care spending will overtake Social Security** as the largest budget item, including Obamacare's coverage expansion provisions: a massive expansion of Medicaid and subsidies for the new health insurance exchanges.
While mandatory **spending is growing out of control** and needs reform, **there are** also plenty of **places to cut in the rest of the budget.** For example, **the I**nternal **R**evenue **S**ervice **spent $4.1 million on a** lavish **conference** in 2010 for 2,609 of its employees in Anaheim, California. Expenses **included $50,000 for line-dancing and "Star Trek" parody videos, $135,350 for outside speakers, $64,000 in conference "swag" for the employees**, plus free meals, cocktails, and hotel suite upgrades.
Beyond waste, **the** federal **government is too big. Energy spending increased over 2,000 percent since 2002**—after adjusting for inflation. Today there are roughly 80 means-tested anti-poverty programs.
Washington must stop kicking the can down the road, or we could soon find ourselves teetering on the edge of a Greece-style meltdown. Instead, **lawmakers should eliminate waste, duplication, and inappropriate spending; privatize functions better left to the private** sector; **and leave areas** best managed **on a** more **local level** to states and localities. And they should make important changes to the entitlement programs so that they become more affordable and benefits help those with the greatest needs.

Link Level

Coral Reefs

Restoring coral reefs is cheap

Staff Reporter 5/14 (Staff Reporter, 5/14/14, “Coral Reef Restoration Cheap, Effective Way of Saving Coastlines; Researchers Say,” Nature World News, Accessed 7/9/14, MX)

Saving coral reefs could be an efficient and cheaper way of saving world's coastlines, a new study has found. Coral reefs are delicate ecosystems and provide shelter to 25 percent of all marine organisms. The latest study found that these reefs can act as the "tough guy" against waves and can dissipate around 97 percent of the wave energy. Researchers used data from 27 previous studies conducted in different regions around the world, from coasts that see normal waves to hurricane level waves. According to the researchers, coral reefs are as good as specially engineered structures that are placed near the coast to prevent wave-related damage. "It's obvious to the eye that waves inside a protected lagoon are much mellower than those crashing on the outer reef crest, but the extent and generality of the energy dissipation revealed by the data analysis for different locations and reef settings was surprising," said study co-author Fiorenza Micheli, a professor of biological sciences at Stanford and Stanford's Hopkins Marine Station,. "It is a huge reduction. The majority of wave energy is lost on the reef crest." Research has shown that human activities are negatively affecting coral reefs. James Cook University scientists recently found that rising ocean temperatures are causing corals to keep the larve close to the home-reef. This change in coral behavior has led to less interlocked structures. Coral reef restoration could benefit coastlines around the world. Around 100 to 200 million people live in areas that are less than 10 meters above sea level. Countries near the Pacific Ocean will reap the maximum benefits of saving the coral reefs, researchers found. The team even estimated and compared the costs of saving the coasts. **They report that building breakwaters will cost around $19,791 per meter (median cost). Saving coral reefs could be much cheaper, with the median cost coming up to $1,290 per meter for coral restoration projects. Also, coral reefs grow, meaning that they could become more valuable in the future. "Reef restoration can also provide additional benefits," Micheli said in a news release. "While reducing risk, coral reefs also support biodiversity, improve water quality, and support fisheries and tourism."**

<u>Desal</u>

Nano chips make desalination cheap

Laylin 14 (Taffline, 4/10/14, Freelance Environmental Journalist, "Nano Water Chip Could Make Desalination Affordable for Everyone" http://inhabitat.com/nano-water-chip-could-make-desalination-affordable-for-everyone/)

With freshwater declining throughout the globe, desalination looks increasingly attractive, but current technologies are expensive, demand far too much energy and are prone to contamination. Now researchers from the University of Texas at Austin and the University of Marburg in Germany have developed a "water chip" that creates a small electrical field that separates salt from seawater. **<u>The technology,</u>** which is still under development and works at the nano scale, **<u>uses so little energy it can run off a store-bought battery!</u>** Read more: Nano Water Chip Could Make Desalination Affordable for Everyone | Inhabitat - Sustainable Design Innovation, Eco Architecture, Green Building The **<u>researchers apply a 3.0 volt electrical charge to the plastic water chip,</u>** which has a microchannel with two branches. By **<u>creating an "ion depletion zone" with an embedded electrode that neutralizes chloride ions, they are able to redirect the salts in the water down one channel, while the fresh water goes down another.</u>** "Like a troll at the foot of the bridge, the ion depletion zone prevents salt from passing through, resulting in the production of freshwater," the team wrote in a recent press release. **<u>Less energy-intensive than current desalination plants, the water chip doesn't rely on a membrane, and can be made portable so that just about anybody living near the sea can purify their own water at home.</u>**

<u>Drilling</u>

New tech makes offshore drilling cheap

Schaefer 1/18(Keith Schaefer, Publisher of Oil and Gas, 1/18/14, "The Offshore Oil Drilling Revolution, and its Game-Changing Technologies," Oil and Gas, http://oilandgas-investments.com/2014/energy-services/offshore-oil-drilling-revolution/, Accessed 7/9/14, MX)

But <u>**the energy sector is**</u> also <u>**using**</u> some funky <u>**technology from other industries—like Apple's iPhone.**</u> The iPhone uses something called a "small-scale accelerometer"—a device that measures changes in movement around them, telling it you've turned the screen sideways and should adjust the view accordingly. <u>**Petroleum engineers simply took this technology and applied it to the drill bit—designing "smart" tools that can tell exactly where they are in space as they move down a well bore.**</u> All <u>**this new technology**</u> does two things: it <u>**makes the well cheaper, and improves aim**</u>

<u>Wave Energy</u>

Wave energy could soon be cost comparable to wind energy

Ocean Energy Council No Date <u>(A not for profit organization dedicated to the development and implementation of ocean energy, "WAVE ENERGY', http://www.oceanenergycouncil.com/ocean-energy/wave-energy/)</u>

<u>It has been estimated that improving technology and economies of scale will allow wave generators to produce electricity at a cost comparable to wind-driven turbines, which produce energy at about 4.5 cents kWh.</u> For now, the best wave generator technology in place in the United Kingdom is producing energy at an average projected/assessed cost of 7.5 cents kWh. **<u>In comparison, electricity generated by large scale coal burning power plants</u>** costs about 2.6 cents per kilowatt-hour. Combined-cycle natural gas turbine technology, the primary source of new electric power capacity is about 3 cents per kilowatt hour or higher. It **<u>is not unusual to average costs of 5 cents per kilowatt-hour and up for municipal utilities districts.</u>**

Wind

Wind is Cheap - technology solves wind farm expenses

Tully 7/8 (Andy Tully, news editor for Oilprice.com, 7/8/14, "Two-bladed Wind Turbines: Something Old Is New Again," Oil Price, http://oilprice.com/Latest-Energy-News/World-News/Two-bladed-Wind-Turbines-Something-Old-Is-New-Again.html, Accessed 7/9/14, MX)

Look at a picture of a wind turbine and you'll see tower topped by a fan with three blades. **A Chinese company is leading an effort to build two-bladed turbines**. There's nothing new about that. What's new is that **they** finally **seem to work properly**. First the good news: As with all research into new, alternative energies, this focuses on economics. Some say **two-bladed turbines could cost 20 percent less to build and install than its conventional three-bladed siblings**, **while** still **equaling their power output**. The bad news? The flexible blades mounted on the windward side of a turbine tower can bow backwards and strike the tower, ruining the blades. It was this snag, discovered 12 years ago, that put two-bladed turbines on the shelf – until now. **China's Ming Yang Wind Power, the world's ninth-largest wind-turbine manufacturer, plans the largest test ever of a two-bladed** turbine **design. It is building a six-megawatt, two-bladed turbine in China this year that is expected to generate as much power as the largest commercial offshore turbines**. The company also plans to build another such farm off the Norwegian coast next year. **The reason for Ming Yang's confidence** in these projects **is that turbine designers have discovered how to keep the blades intact**. Peter **Jamieson** of Scotland's Garrad Hassan **& Partners mounted the turbines on the downwind side of the towers and applied a technique called roto-braking to lower their risk of striking the towers regardless of wind speed. Offshore wind farms enjoy steadier breezes than those based on land**, but they're about twice as expensive to install and maintain. This, though, can be mitigated in part by the use of **two-bladed turbines**, which **use fewer materials and so are lighter than three-bladed turbines.**

Offshore wind costs per megawatt hour are identical to coal

Shahan 11 (Zachary, 3/11/2011, Site Director & Publishing Services Manager at Important Media, "Wind Energy Cost-Competitive with Coal in Some Regions", http://cleantechnica.com/2011/03/09/wind-energy-cost-competitive-with-coal-in-some-regions/)

Perhaps not in your part of the world, but according to the latest report from Bloomberg New Energy Finance, **in many parts of the world, onshore wind power is now completely cost-competitive with coal.** Reportedly, **in** some regions of Brazil, Mexico, Sweden and **the United States, wind power has gotten down to $68/MWh. Coal power** in those same regions — **$67/MWh. And this isn't even taking the tremendous health costs of coal into account. The DOE rolled out a 10-year plan last month aimed at making wind and solar power cost-competitive with coal.** Clearly, in some regions, that won't be a problem.

Internals

Spending Causes Growth

Spending helps the economy

Pyke, Deputy Economic Policy Editor for ThinkProgress.org, **14**

(Alan, 1/14/14, “United States Notches Record $53 Billion Budget Surplus in December”, http://thinkprogress.org/economy/2014/01/14/3158271/december-surplus-record-austerity/, AL)

Last year’s deficit was the smallest since 2008 and less than half of what it was in 2009. The **pullback in** government **spending has been a drag on economic growth** for years.¶ While falling annual deficits and record monthly surpluses are a sign of success for spending hawks, it’s not a good thing for the American economy. **With unemployment still** very **high** and millions giving up on finding work after years of fruitless post-recession job hunting, many economists would argue **the government needs to be spending aggressively to boost economic growth. Instead**, **the government is investing less** in the economy now **than** at **any time since** **World War II.** **The Federal Reserve’s** radical **bond-buying program** — the only thing that kept the economy from sliding into a recession thanks to the trillions of dollars’ worth of austerity measures enacted since 2010 — **begins to wind** slowly **down** this month, potentially **exacerbating the negative impacts of the government’s thriftiness.**¶ News of the monthly surplus record comes just days after the paltry December jobs report showed only 74,000 net jobs gained nationwide in the final month of 2013. That was far below both what economists expected (200,000 jobs) and the monthly average for 2013 (182,000 jobs). **Thanks t**o the **spending cuts** zeal of recent years, **the** immediate **future is dim for** the millions of **Americans who have been out of work** for more than six months **and** therefore **rely** **upon** Emergency Unemployment Compensation (**EUC**) from the federal government. Congressional negotiators failed to extend that program in last year’s budget deal, and Republicans are now blocking efforts to reinstate the lapsed benefit program. State economies lost $400 million in economic activity in just the first week after the program dried up.

spending cuts hurts the econ

Liberto, senior writer for CNN, **13**

(Jennifer, 10/18/13, “Spending cuts are hurting economy”, http://money.cnn.com/2013/10/18/news/economy/sequester-economy-shutdown/, AL)

The nation has been operating on a shrunken budget, slashed by $80 billion in forced spending cuts **since March 1.** And **already, the** so-called **sequester** has **dragged down economic growth,** experts say.¶ As government workers returned to work Thursday, Defense Secretary Chuck Hagel warned employees that the economic pain could continue for his agency, because "Congress did not end the budget uncertainty that has cast such a shadow ... over this Department for much of the year."¶ The Bipartisan Policy Center too warned in a report this month that widespread economic pain is already beginning to kick in, as the money (or lack of it) is finally starting to pinch.¶ The brunt of the cuts have fallen in areas like medical and science research funding and services that help the poor, sick and elderly.¶ **The sequester slashed 57,000 children this fall from the rolls of Head Start daycare and preschool** programs, **available for poor families nationwide.**¶ About two-thirds of Meals on Wheels programs had to reduce the number of meals they served, by an average of 364 meals per week, a survey found.¶ The **lack of government funds** has **also led to layoffs of hundreds of science and medical research job**s, according to a survey by the American Society for Biochemistry and Molecular Biology and 15

other scientific societies.¶ The cuts have also undermined federal public defenders' ability to defend those accused of federal crimes -- a constitutional right for people who can't afford a lawyer. Furloughs have delayed many cases -- prompting U.S. District Judge Richard George Kopf in Nebraska to declare: "It is time to tell Congress to go to hell."¶ The Bipartisan Policy Center suggests that if the cuts continue, economic impact on the defense industry will be double in 2014 what it was in 2013.¶ "**The full brunt of the cuts hasn't hit, and if we go down the sequester path for too long, we won't be able to reverse the devastating impac**ts," according to the report.

Spending now is key to economic growth

Krugman, 2014 (Paul Krugman; professor of Economics and International Affairs at Princeton University; “Demography and the Bicycle Effect”; 5/19/2014; http://krugman.blogs.nytimes.com/2014/05/19/demography-and-the-bicycle-effect/; Date Accessed: 7/7/14)

It’s a pretty straightforward point. To have more or less full employment, **we need sufficient spending to make use of the economy’s potential**. But **one important component of spending, investment, is subject to the accelerator effect: the demand for new capital depends on the economy’s rate of growth**, rather than the current level of output. So if growth slows due to a falloff in population growth, investment demand falls — potentially pushing the economy into a semi-permanent slump.

Spending stimulates the economy

Krugman, 2014 (Paul Krugman; professor of Economics and International Affairs at Princeton University; “Macroeconomics and Class Warfare”; 4/28/2014; http://krugman.blogs.nytimes.com/2014/04/28/macroeconomics-and-class-warfare/; Date Accessed: 7/7/14)

Back **when Obama was proposing a spending plan to boost the economy, and some of us were pleading for a bigger plan**, **it was common to hear** people from both the right and **the crazy** center **declaring that it was all a ruse**, **an attempt to smuggle** in liberal **priorities under the guise of fiscal stimulus**. This was, as it happens, completely false – and in the case of the right-wingers, a case of projection. After all, Obama didn’t try to sell permanent spending increases as short-run stimulus – but Bush did exactly that when pushing his tax cuts. And what’s more, it wouldn’t have worked. **If anything, your best bet is to** try it the other way – to **push proposals that will stimulate the economy** while also building infrastructure and/or reducing inequality, and to make the long-run, class-warfare aspects the heart of your sales pitch. This may seem odd. Shouldn’t it be easier to sell win-win ideas, which will make everyone or almost everyone better off? Well, it would be if the public “got” Keynesian economics. But **even educated readers tend not to get the idea that the economy as a whole can suffer from inadequate demand** (hey, lots of U. of Chicago professors don’t get it either.) And I don’t think it’s for want of efforts to get the point across. **The key sticking point is right at the beginning**. Never mind monetary and fiscal policy; **the very notion that the economy can suffer from too little spending turns out to be inherently difficult. When I give public talks, I get some traction (I think) by asking people what happens if everyone tries to cut his or her spending at the same time, then pointing out that my spending is your income and your spending is my income**. But I don’t think it sticks for many people: the appeal of the economy-as-household metaphor usually takes over.

Spending lays the groundwork for economic expansion

Amy, No Date (Douglas J. Amy; Professor of Politics at Mount Holyoke College; “The Deficit Scare: Myth vs. Reality”; http://www.governmentisgood.com/articles.php?aid=30&p=1; Date Accessed: 7/9/14)

Clearly this anti-deficit campaign is part of the larger "starving the beast" strategy that was discussed in another article. But **deficits and debt are complicated topics that merit some analysis on their own**. This article takes on the "deficit hawks" and critically examines their arguments. It will show that (1) Republicans only care about deficits when the money is being spent on liberal programs; (2) **our current large deficits have not been caused by overspending by the Obama administration**; (3) **deficit spending is an essential tool for combating economic recessions and depression**s; (4) public debt **can fuel vital public investments in education, technology, and infrastructure that lay the groundwork for future economic expansion**; (5) the inflated and misleading right-wing rhetoric about deficits and debt is distracting from a more rational and helpful discussion of the financial problems that we do face as a nation.

Spending provides a large economic boost and prevents collapse.

Amy, No Date (Douglas J. Amy; Professor of Politics at Mount Holyoke College; "The Deficit Scare: Myth vs. Reality"; http://www.governmentisgood.com/articles.php?aid=30&p=1; Date Accessed: 7/9/14)

But irrespective of their motivations, **aren't Republicans right that deficit spending is a terrible idea and we must stop doing it**? Aren't balanced budgets just a matter of common sense? **The answer is "No."** In fact, a good case can be made that **deficit spending is an indispensable government tool in addressing serious economic problems**. For example, most **economists agree that deficit spending during a recession, especially a severe one, is a very good thing to do**. Even though tax revenues are decreasing, **the best thing for the economy is for the government to keep spending money, and even increase spending. When consumer and corporate spending are swooning, only the government is in the position to spend money and stimulate economic activity. The market will not take care of this problem, so the government must step in. Government spending has a multiplier effect that provides a large economic boost** during recessions. If it spends money on building schools and roads, for example, that money first helps constructions companies. These companies in turn will hire more workers who will then spend more money on goods and services, thus helping other businesses. The construction companies will also purchase more tools and materials from other businesses, who will then hire more workers, and so on. In this way, **deficit spending spreads through the economy, lessening the impact of recessions and helping to speed economic recovery**. And as the economy rebounds, this produces higher tax revenues, which eventually lessens the need for deficit spending. Contrary to the wildly erroneous claims of the political right, most economists agree that the **deficit spending and economic stimulus programs of the Obama administration provided enormous benefits**. A 2010 study by Alan Blinder of Princeton and Mark Zandy of Moody's Analytics found that **the combined effect of the fiscal stimulus package, TARP, and the actions of the Federal Reserve Board raised real GDP 11% over where it would have been, saved an estimated 8 million jobs, and probably averted deflation and a depression.** They concluded: "It is clear that laissez faire was not an option; **policymakers had to act.** Not responding would have left both the economy and the government's fiscal situ-ation in far graver condition. We conclude that Ben Bernanke was probably right when he said that 'We came very close in October [2008] to Depression 2.0.'"

Spending is key—with out it economies would suffer another great depression.

Amy, No Date (Douglas J. Amy; Professor of Politics at Mount Holyoke College; "The Deficit Scare: Myth vs. Reality"; http://www.governmentisgood.com/articles.php?aid=30&p=1; Date Accessed: 7/9/14)

The worst thing the federal government could have done was to listen to the deficit hawks and **curtailed spending in the face of a severe recession**. **To see why, you simply need to look at state governments that did this in recent years**. **As their economies were tanking, many state governments** – which are constitutionally required to balance their budgets – **had to lay off workers, cut benefits to individuals, and curtail purchases of goods from the private sector**. **This simply made a bad economic situation worse**. It created a kind of reverse multiplier effect,. **taking money and jobs out of the**

economy and lowering demand for goods and services in an already weak economy **Instead of speeding an economic recovery, this kind of frugal spending policy actually slows it down. It hardly makes sense to kick the economy when it is down**, but this is what happens if governments are forced to balance their budgets every year. If the Republicans continue to be successful in **blocking further stimulus spending**, this **will only hurt the economy**. At best, it will delay recovery from the recession, and at worst, **it might actually precipitate a dip back into more severe recession**. Either way, **this will only add up to more suffering for millions of American workers**. Chronic long term unemployment has reached heights not seen since the Great Depression of the 1930s. This is the real crisis facing many Americans. They are out of a job, out of savings, and losing their house. Their American dream is fading fast. **Only the government is in the position to help – to stimulate the economy to produce more jobs**. And yet the Republicans keep insisting that budget balancing must be our first priority – thus leaving millions of jobless working class and middle class Americans hung out to dry.

Spending causes an economic boom-WWII proves.

Amy, No Date (Douglas J. Amy; Professor of Politics at Mount Holyoke College; "The Deficit Scare: Myth vs. Reality"; http://www.governmentisgood.com/articles.php?aid=30&p=1; Date Accessed: 7/9/14)

Conservatives are also wrong when they argue that deficit spending and a large national debt will inevitably undermine economic growth. To see why, we need to simply look back at times when we have run up large deficits and increased the national debt**. The best example is World War II when the national debt soared to 120% of GDP – nearly twice the size of today's debt.** This **spending not only got us out of the Great Depression but set the stage for a prolonged period of sustained economic growth in the 50s and 60s**. **Massive investments were made in science and technology, American workers were re-trained and re-employed, private investment was encouraged, and consumer purchasing power was increased**. **That** 25-year **post-war economic boom**, with the most rapid increase in living standards in our history**, would not have happened without the stimulus of all this deficit spending.**

Spending is a major stimulus to economic growth

Amy, No Date (Douglas J. Amy; Professor of Politics at Mount Holyoke College; "The Deficit Scare: Myth vs. Reality"; http://www.governmentisgood.com/articles.php?aid=30&p=1; Date Accessed: 7/11/14)

But there is even a more important issue here – one often brought up by Joseph Stiglitz, **a Nobel Prize winning economist**. He **argues that deficit spending**, when it is done right, **can be a major stimulus to economic growth and actually lower long term government debt**.7 When economic growth is back on healthy terms, this leads to increased tax revenues, which eventually lessen the need for government to borrow money. For Stiglitz, **the key is to spend that deficit money on thing**s like education, technology, and infrastructure **that lay the groundwork for future economic expansion**. **We will not remain competitive with other countries for long if we don't** have decent roads, efficient airports, adequate clean water supplies, and sufficient school facilities. Recently the American Society of Civil Engineers estimated that over the next five years it would take at least $1.6 trillion to bring our national infrastructure into an acceptable state. These are huge investments that the private sector is unwilling to make**. Going into debt** to pay for these things **is a good investment in our collective futures.**

Spending ensures a growing economy

Amy, No Date (Douglas J. Amy; Professor of Politics at Mount Holyoke College; "The Deficit Scare: Myth vs. Reality"; http://www.governmentisgood.com/articles.php?aid=30&p=1; Date Accessed: 7/11/14)

Finally, as noted earlier**, government spending can be crucial for ensuring a prosperous and growing economy**. A large part of the **economic growth in the last twenty years has been fueled by various kinds of private sector economic bubbles. This is hardly desirable or sustainable**. In the 1990s, there was a large technology bubble that created billions in apparent investment profits. Later, it was the housing bubble which encouraged consumers to borrow and spend much more money because of the rapidly increasing value of their homes. When these bubbles burst, they took the economy down with them. **Today, we need a more stable and reliable way of encouraging economic growth. Public investments** in emerging technologies, like alternative energy, **could prove to be a valuable part of that economic strategy. If we can leave our children a sustainable growing economy, this could be their greatest inheritance.**

A2: Spending Causes Collapse

Spending aids governments and averts collapse

Krugman, 2011 (Paul Krugman; professor of Economics and International Affairs at Princeton University; "The Truth About Federal Spending"; 7/29/2011; http://krugman.blogs.nytimes.com/2011/07/29/the-truth-about-federal-spending/; Date Accessed: 7/7/14)

Whenever someone like me or Bruce Bartlett points out how little Obama resembles the right's portrait of a raging leftist, someone is sure to come back with the assertion that **Obama has presided over a vast expansion of federal spending**. Even people who really should know better, like John Taylor, do it. So what's the truth? I've written about this before, but here's another take. The fact is that **federal spending rose from 19.6% of GDP in fiscal 2007 to 23.8% of GDP in fiscal 2010**. So isn't that a huge spending spree? Well, no. First of all, the size of a ratio depends on the denominator as well as the numerator. GDP has fallen sharply relative to the economy's potential; here's the ratio of real GDP to the CBO's estimate of potential GDP: **A 6 percent fall in GDP relative to trend, all by itself, would have raised the ratio of spending to GDP from 19.6 to 20.8, or about 30 percent of the actual rise. That still leaves a rise in spending**; but most of that is safety-net programs, which spend more in hard times because more people are in distress. **The CBO breaks out "income security**" (Table E-10 in Historical Budget Tables), which is unemployment insurance, food stamps, etc., and also gives us numbers on Medicaid; here's what they look like as percentages of GDP: That's another 2 points of GDP, or about half the rise. So **we're still left with a bit, around 1 point of GDP. That's the stimulus, more or less**. And there are two things you need to know about it. First, it's temporary, and already fading out fast. Second, a large part of the stimulus **"spending" was actually aid to state and local governments, intended not to expand spending but to avert a fall** — that is, it was about maintaining government, not expanding it.

Spending myths are wrong-Spending actually has a 'large positive multiplier'

Krugman, 2014 (Paul Krugman; professor of Economics and International Affairs at Princeton University; "No Time For Sargent"; 4/21/2014; http://krugman.blogs.nytimes.com/2014/04/21/no-time-for-sargent/; Date Accessed: 7/7/14)

So when **Sargent** reminds us that communities face trade-offs, that's much less clear at a time when the community is not at all like an individual – in which there are substantial amounts of unemployed resources, and putting those resources to work would be pure gain, not a tradeoff. And then he **tells us this: When a government spends, its citizens eventually pay, either today or tomorrow, either through explicit taxes or implicit ones like inflation.** There are very good reasons to believe that **this is just wrong under current conditions. There's overwhelming evidence that in an economy against the zero lower bound government spending has a large, positive multiplier, so the goods the government buys don't come at the expense of other consumption or investment; and there's a reasonable argument to the effect that even in purely fiscal terms spending more than pays for itself.**

Spending helps sustain the economy and prevents a second Great Depression

Krugman, 2013 (Paul Krugman; professor of Economics and International Affairs at Princeton University; "Dwindling Deficit Disorder"; 3/10/2013; http://www.nytimes.com/2013/03/11/opinion/krugman-dwindling-deficit-disorder.html?_r=0; Date Accessed: 7/8/14)

For three years and more, **policy debate** in Washington **has been dominated by warnings about the dangers of budget deficits**. A few lonely economists have tried from the beginning to point out **that this fixation is**

all wrong, that **deficit spending is actually appropriate** in a depressed economy. But even though the deficit scolds have been wrong about everything so far — where are the soaring interest rates we were promised? — protests that we are having the wrong conversation have consistently fallen on deaf ears. What's really remarkable at this point, however, is the persistence of the deficit fixation in the face of rapidly changing facts. People still talk as if the deficit were exploding, as if the United States budget were on an unsustainable path; in fact, the deficit is falling more rapidly than it has for generations, it is already down to sustainable levels, and it is too small given the state of the economy. Start with the raw numbers. **America's budget deficit soared after the 2008 financial crisis** and the recession that went with it, **as revenue plunged and spending on unemployment benefits and other safety-net programs rose**. And **this rise in the deficit was a good thing**! **Federal spending helped sustain the economy at a time when the private sector was in panicked retreat; arguably, the stabilizing role of a large government was the main reason the Great Recession didn't turn into a full replay of the Great Depression.** But after peaking in 2009 at $1.4 trillion, the deficit began coming down. The Congressional Budget Office expects the deficit for fiscal 2013 (which began in October and is almost half over) to be $845 billion. That may still sound like a big number, but given the state of the economy it really isn't. Bear in mind that the budget doesn't have to be balanced to put us on a fiscally sustainable path; all we need is a deficit small enough that debt grows more slowly than the economy. To take the classic example, America never did pay off the debt from World War II — in fact, our debt doubled in the 30 years that followed the war. But debt as a percentage of G.D.P. fell by three-quarters over the same period. Right now, a sustainable deficit would be around $460 billion. The actual deficit is bigger than that. But according to new estimates by the budget office, half of our current deficit reflects the effects of a still-depressed economy. The "cyclically adjusted" deficit — what the deficit would be if we were near full employment — is only about $423 billion, which puts it in the sustainable range; next year the budget office expects that number to fall to just $172 billion. And that's why budget office projections show the nation's debt position more or less stable over the next decade. So we do not, repeat do not, face any kind of deficit crisis either now or for years to come. There are, of course, longer-term fiscal issues: rising health costs and an aging population will put the budget under growing pressure over the course of the 2020s. But I have yet to see any coherent explanation of why these longer-run concerns should determine budget policy right now. And as I said, given the needs of the economy, the deficit is currently too small. Put it this way: **Smart fiscal policy involves having the government spend** when the private sector won't, **supporting the economy when it is weak and reducing debt only when it is strong.** Yet the cyclically adjusted deficit as a share of G.D.P. is currently about what it was in 2006, at the height of the housing boom — and it is headed down. Yes, **we'll want to reduce deficits** once the economy recovers, and there are gratifying signs that a solid recovery is finally under way. But unemployment, especially long-term unemployment, is still unacceptably high. "**The boom, not the slump, is the time for austerity**," John Maynard Keynes declared many years ago. He was right — all you have to do is look at Europe to see the disastrous effects of austerity on weak economies. And this is still nothing like a boom. Now, I'm aware that the facts about our dwindling deficit are unwelcome in many quarters. Fiscal fearmongering is a major industry inside the Beltway, especially among those looking for excuses to do what they really want, namely dismantle Medicare, Medicaid and Social Security. **People whose careers are heavily invested in the deficit-scold industry don't want to let evidence undermine their scare tactics; as the deficit dwindles, we're sure to encounter a blizzard of bogus numbers purporting to show that we're still in some kind of fiscal crisis.** But we aren't. The deficit is indeed dwindling, and the case for making the deficit a central policy concern, which was never very strong given low borrowing costs and high unemployment, has now completely vanished.

Spending averts a great depression

Stiglitz, 2010 (Joseph E. Stiglitz; University Professor at Columbia University and recipient of the 2001 Nobel Prize in Economics; "Stiglitz: The Dangers of Deficit Reduction"; 3/5/10; http://www.sfbg.com/bruce/2010/03/05/stiglitz-dangers-deficit-reduction; Date Accessed: 7/11/14)

NEW YORK – A wave of fiscal austerity is rushing over Europe and America. The magnitude of budget deficits – like the magnitude of the downturn – has taken many by surprise. But despite protests by the yesterday's proponents of deregulation, who would like the government to remain passive, **most economists believe that government spending has made a difference, helping to avert another Great Depression.** Most economists also agree that it is a mistake to look at only one side of a balance sheet (whether for the public or private sector). One has to look not only at what a country or firm owes, but also at its assets. This should help answer those financial sector hawks who are raising alarms about government spending. After all, even deficit hawks acknowledge that we should be focusing not on today's deficit, but on the long-term national **debt. Spending, especially on investments** in education, technology, and infrastructure**, can actually lead to lower long-term deficits.** Banks' short-sightedness helped create the crisis; we cannot let government short-sightedness –

prodded by the financial sector – prolong it. **Faster growth and returns on public investment yield higher tax revenues, and a 5 to 6% return is more than enough to offset temporary increases in the national debt. A social cost-benefit analysis (taking into account impacts other than on the budget) makes such expenditures, even when debt-financed, even more attractive.** Finally, **most economists agree that, apart from these considerations, the appropriate size of a deficit depends in part on the state of the economy**. A weaker economy calls for a larger deficit, and the appropriate size of the deficit in the face of a recession depends on the precise circumstances. It is here that economists disagree. Forecasting is always difficult, but especially so in troubled times. What has happened is (fortunately) not an everyday occurrence; it would be foolish to look at past recoveries to predict this one. In America, for instance, bad debt and foreclosures are at levels not seen for three-quarters of a century; the decline in credit in 2009 was the largest since 1942. Comparisons to the Great Depression are also deceptive, because the economy today is so different in so many ways. And nearly all so-called experts have proven highly fallible – witness the United States Federal Reserve's dismal forecasting record before the crisis. Yet, **even with large deficits, economic growth in the US and Europe is anemic, and forecasts of private-sector growth suggest that in the absence of continued government support, there is risk of continued stagnation** – of growth too weak to return unemployment to normal levels anytime soon. The risks are asymmetric: if these forecasts are wrong, and there is a more robust recovery, then, of course, expenditures can be cut back and/or taxes increased. But **if these forecasts are right, then a premature "exit" from deficit spending risks pushing the economy back into recession. This is one of the lessons we should have learned from America's experience in the Great Depression; it is also one of the lessons to emerge from Japan's experience in the late 1990's.** These points are particularly germane for the hardest-hit economies. The United Kingdom, for example, has had a harder time than other countries for an obvious reason: it had a real-estate bubble (though of less consequence than in Spain), and finance, which was at the epicenter of the crisis, played a more important role in its economy than it does in other countries. The UK's weaker performance is not the result of worse policies; indeed, compared to the US, its bank bailouts and labor-market policies were, in many ways, far better. It avoided the massive waste of human resources associated with high unemployment in America, where almost one out of five people who would like a full-time job cannot find one. As the global economy returns to growth, **governments should, of course, have plans on the drawing** board to raise taxes and cut expenditures. The right balance will inevitably be a subject of dispute. Principles like "it is better to tax bad things than good things" might suggest imposing environmental taxes. The financial sector has imposed huge externalities on the rest of society. America's financial industry polluted the world with toxic mortgages, and, in line with the well established "polluter pays" principle, taxes should be imposed on it. Besides, well-designed taxes on the financial sector might help alleviate problems caused by excessive leverage and banks that are too big to fail. Taxes on speculative activity might encourage banks to focus greater attention on performing their key societal role of providing credit. Over the longer term, most **economists agree that governments,** especially in advanced industrial countries with aging populations, **should be concerned about the sustainability of their policies**. But we must be wary of deficit fetishism. Deficits to finance wars or give-aways to the financial sector (as happened on a massive scale in the US) lead to liabilities without corresponding assets, imposing a burden on future generations. **But high-return public investments that more than pay for themselves can actually improve the well-being of future generations, and it would be doubly foolish to burden them with debts from unproductive spending and then cut back on productive investments.** These are questions for a later day – at least in many countries, prospects of a robust recovery are, at best, a year or two away. For now, the economics is clear: **reducing government spending is a risk not worth taking.**

A2: Downgrade

U.S. downgrade wouldn't hurt the economy—markets already know the risks, the impacts should have happened, ratings don't make sense in terms of treasuries, and there is no where else to invest—there is literally ZERO risk of the DA

Hough 2011(Jack, Smart Money Staff, July 27, "S&P, Moody's U.S. Downgrade Irrelevant ", http://www.smartmoney.com/invest/stocks/sp-moodys-downgraded-to-irrelevant-1311719817477/)

Given that Treasury bonds have historically served as a benchmark against which the safety of other investments is judged, the spillover effects would be "extremely damaging" for the world economy, a senior advisor for the International Monetary Fund said this week.¶ Someone forgot to tell the investors who stake actual money in Treasury bonds, however. **The closely watched 10-year Treasury has gained since the beginning of the year**, dropping its yield from 3.4% to 3.0%. That means **interest rates on the things the president mentioned aren't expected to "skyrocket**" soon--not even if the rocket he had in mind is only one of those backyard balsa-wood-and-gunpowder fliers. ¶ Maybe financial markets are waiting for the actual downgrades. But that would contradict an investment law as basic as gravity: Markets are forward-looking. **At any given moment, they anticipate information that's known or even suspected.** S&P announced a negative outlook on the U.S. (warning of a possible downgrade) in April, and **Moody's announced** something similar **earlier this month**. By now, **anything that would have happened has happened**.¶ It's not that investors doubt the judgment of raters, although the latter have attracted plenty of jeers in recent years, partly because their pay-me-to-rate-you business models are inherently awkward, and partly because they have missed some colossal collapses. Enron had an investment-grade credit rating four days before it went bankrupt. During the recent housing bust, mortgage securities that were sold as Parmigiano-Reggiano turned out to be a notch below Cheez Whiz. That has led some outside analysts to mutiny. In December, Meredith Whitney, who made her name covering banks, told CBS's "60 Minutes" that 50 to 100 "sizeable" municipalities could default on amounts totaling "hundreds of billions of dollars," directly contradicting the ratings agencies, who expect that municipal defaults will be isolated and manageable. ¶ So far, the ratings agencies have been right on municipalities. I suspect that they've taken recent criticism to heart and are working hard to produce good research. And in fairness, creditworthiness is a complicated thing to judge, depending as it does on human behavior, and the agencies get plenty of calls right. If they say the U.S. is bucking for a downgrade, I'll take their word for it. I'm unfashionably bullish on America, but I'm not sure anything deserves a perfect credit rating, least of all something that can make its own money.¶ But I also think **the opinions of** S&P and **Moody's** (and Fitch, which says it will decide its opinion of the U.S. in August) **are irrelevant when it comes to Treasurys**. These firms add value by tracking a universe of bond issuers too vast for most investors to watch. Their opinions on Ford Motor or the city of Rochester, N.Y., matter greatly to bond buyers. ¶ **The world doesn't need help analyzing Treasurys**, though. **No entity in the world is more closely watched than the United States government**, not even Lady Gaga. And none publishes more and better information on its financial condition. The sort of **investors who decide Treasury prices**--foreign governments, giant mutual funds, the Social Security Trust Fund--**don't wait for S&P or Moody's to tell them whether to buy. They do the math themselves.¶ They also have limited choices.** In

a recent report for Wells Fargo Securities, economist Jay Bryson writes that **investors aren't likely to dump Treasurys**, simply because **Europe has no unified debt security and most Asian capital markets are small and illiquid**, save for that of Japan, which is in worse shape than the U.S**. What about the fear that large investment funds, bound by prospectus to buy only AAA-rated bonds**, would be forced to sell? Bryson calls this "overblown" for two reasons. **Mutual funds hold just 7% of Treasurys**. Also, **Bryson's team** **reviewed prospectuses for the largest ones and found no such mandate**. ¶ So fear the debt and the deficit a little and political intransigence a lot, but **don't fear the alphabetical Armageddon of a dozen researchers swapping their As for Bs.** I'm guessing about the number, by the way. None of the agencies would tell me how many analysts decide their U.S. rating or even how much of the decision is based on perceptions rather than numbers. A document provided by Fitch says its minimum committee size is generally four analysts including one "senior director," and that those average six to seven years of tenure. That's comforting. If I'm wrong, I'd hate for the world's financial system to be brought down by new hires.

Downgrade has ZERO IMPACT—markets don't care about ratings because it's a risk-free asset

Detrixhe 10/9(John, Bloomberg Staff, 2012, "U.S. Downgrade Seen as Upgrade as U.S. Debt Dissolved", http://www.bloomberg.com/news/2012-10-09/u-s-downgrade-seen-as-upgrade-as-u-s-debt-dissolved.html)

Reduced borrowing means there is less competition for the U.S. Treasury Department as it sells debt to fund spending programs to help the nation recover from the worst financial crisis since the Great Depression. **Credit-rating firms are discounting** the **improvement even as debt**, equity **and currency markets suggest the U.S. is more creditworthy than before Standard & Poor's stripped the nation of its AAA grade** in 2011. ¶ "Most **people don't pay much attention to ratings when it comes to Treasuries, as they are still considered to be risk- free assets**," Donald Ellenberger, who oversees about $10 billion as co-head of government and mortgage-backed securities at Federated Investors in Pittsburgh, said Oct. 5 in a telephone interview. "Until that perception changes **Treasuries will continue to be" in demand**, he said.

Impact Level

No Impact to Collapse

No impact to economy

Drezner 14 (Daniel Drezner, IR prof at Tufts, The System Worked: Global Economic Governance during the Great Recession, World Politics, Volume 66. Number 1, January 2014, pp. 123-164)

The final significant outcome addresses **a dog** that **hasn't barked**: the effect of the Great Recession on cross-border conflict and violence. **During the initial stages of the crisis, multiple analysts asserted that the financial crisis would lead states to increase their use of force** as a tool for staying in power.42 They voiced genuine concern that the global economic downturn would lead to an increase in conflict—**whether through** greater internal **repression, diversionary wars, arms races, or a ratcheting up of great power conflict**. Violence in the Middle East, border disputes in the South China Sea, and even the disruptions of the Occupy movement fueled impressions of a surge in global public disorder. **The aggregate data suggest otherwise, however**. The Institute for Economics and Peace has concluded that "**the average level of peacefulness in 2012 is approximately the same as it was in 2007**."43 **Interstate violence** in particular **has declined since the start of the financial crisis, as have military expenditures** in most sampled countries. Other **studies confirm that the Great Recession has not triggered any increase in violent conflict**, as Lotta Themner and Peter Wallensteen conclude: "[T]he pattern is one of relative stability when we consider the trend for the past five years."44 **The** secular **decline in violence that started with the end of the Cold War has not been reversed**. Rogers Brubaker observes that "**the crisis has not** to date **generated the surge in protectionist nationalism or ethnic exclusion that might have been expected**."43

Impact empirically denied

Barnett 09 (Thomas P.M. Barnett, senior managing director of Enterra Solutions LLC, "The New Rules: Security Remains Stable Amid Financial Crisis," 8/25/2009)

When the global financial crisis struck roughly a year ago, the blogosphere was ablaze with all sorts of scary predictions of, and commentary regarding, ensuing conflict and wars -- a rerun of the Great Depression leading to world war, as it were. Now, as global economic news brightens and recovery -- surprisingly led by China and emerging markets -- is the talk of the day, it's interesting to look back over the past year and realize how **globalization's first truly worldwide recession has had virtually no impact whatsoever on the international security** landscape. **None of the** more than three-dozen **ongoing conflicts** listed by GlobalSecurity.org **can be** clearly **attributed to the** global **recession.** Indeed, the last new entry (civil conflict between Hamas and Fatah in the Palestine) predates the economic crisis by a year, and three quarters of the chronic struggles began in the last century. Ditto for the 15 low-intensity conflicts listed by Wikipedia (where the latest entry is the Mexican "drug war" begun in 2006). Certainly, the Russia-Georgia conflict last August was specifically timed, but by most accounts the opening ceremony of the Beijing Olympics was the most important external trigger (followed by the U.S. presidential campaign) for that sudden spike in an almost two-decade long struggle between Georgia and its two breakaway regions. Looking over the various databases, then, we see a most familiar picture: the usual mix of civil conflicts, insurgencies, and liberation-themed terrorist movements. Besides the recent Russia-Georgia dust-up, the only two potential state-on-state wars (North v. South Korea, Israel v. Iran) are both tied to one side acquiring a nuclear weapon

capacity -- a process wholly unrelated to global economic trends. And with the United States effectively tied down by its two ongoing major interventions (Iraq and Afghanistan-bleeding-into-Pakistan), our involvement elsewhere around the planet has been quite modest, both leading up to and following the onset of the economic crisis: e.g., the usual counter-drug efforts in Latin America, the usual military exercises with allies across Asia, mixing it up with pirates off Somalia's coast). Everywhere else we find serious instability we pretty much let it burn, occasionally pressing the Chinese -- unsuccessfully -- to do something. Our new Africa Command, for example, hasn't led us to anything beyond advising and training local forces. So, to sum up: * No significant uptick in mass violence or unrest (remember the smattering of urban riots last year in places like Greece, Moldova and Latvia?); * The usual frequency maintained in civil conflicts (in all the usual places); * Not a single state-on-state war directly caused (and no great-power-on-great-power crises even triggered); * **No** great improvement or **disruption in great-power cooperation** regarding the emergence of new nuclear powers (despite all that diplomacy); * A modest scaling back of international policing efforts by the system's acknowledged Leviathan power (inevitable given the strain); and * No serious efforts by any rising great power to challenge that Leviathan or supplant its role. (The worst things we can cite are Moscow's occasional deployments of strategic assets to the Western hemisphere and its weak efforts to outbid the United States on basing rights in Kyrgyzstan; but the best include China and India stepping up their aid and investments in Afghanistan and Iraq.) Sure, we've finally seen global defense spending surpass the previous world record set in the late 1980s, but even that is likely to wane given the stress on public budgets created by all this unprecedented "stimulus" spending. If anything, the **friendly cooperation** on such stimulus packaging **was the most notable** great-power **dynamic** caused by the crisis. Can we say that the world has suffered a distinct shift to political radicalism as a result of the economic crisis? Indeed, no. The world's major **economies remain governed by center**-left or center-right political **factions that remain decidedly friendly to both markets and trade. In the short run, there were attempts across the board to insulate economies from immediate damage (in effect, as much protectionism as allowed under current trade rules), but there was no great slide into "trade wars." Instead, the World Trade Organization is functioning as it was designed to function, and regional efforts toward free-trade agreements have not slowed.** Can we say Islamic radicalism was inflamed by the economic crisis? If it was, that shift was clearly overwhelmed by the Islamic world's growing disenchantment with the brutality displayed by violent extremist groups such as al-Qaida. And looking forward, austere economic times are just as likely to breed connecting evangelicalism as disconnecting fundamentalism. At the end of the day, the economic crisis did not prove to be sufficiently frightening to provoke major economies into establishing global regulatory schemes, even as it has sparked a spirited -- and much needed, as I argued last week -- discussion of the continuing viability of the U.S. dollar as the world's primary reserve currency. Naturally, plenty of experts and pundits have attached great significance to this debate, seeing in it the beginning of "economic warfare" and the like between "fading" America and "rising" China. And yet, in a world of globally integrated production chains and interconnected financial markets, such "diverging interests" hardly constitute signposts for wars up ahead. Frankly, I don't welcome a world in which America's fiscal profligacy goes undisciplined, so bring it on -- please! Add it all up and it's fair to say that this global financial crisis has proven the great resilience of America's post-World War II international liberal trade order.

No rational for war

Jervis '11 (Robert Jervis, Professor in the Department of Political Science and School of International and Public Affairs at Columbia University, "Force in Our Times," Survival, Vol. 25, No. 4, p. 403-425, December 2011)

Even if war is still seen as evil, the security community could be dissolved if severe conflicts of interest were to arise. Could the more peaceful world generate new interests that would bring the members of the community into sharp disputes? 45 A zero-sum sense of status would be one example, perhaps linked to a steep rise in nationalism. More likely would be a **worsening of the current economic difficulties, which could itself produce** greater **nationalism**, undermine democracy and bring back old-fashioned beggar-my-neighbor economic policies. **While these dangers are real, it is hard to believe that the conflicts could be great enough to lead the members of the community to contemplate fighting each other**. It is not so much that economic interdependence has proceeded to the point where it could not be reversed – states that were more internally interdependent than anything seen internationally have fought bloody civil wars. Rather it is that **even if the more extreme versions of free trade and economic liberalism become discredited, it is hard to see how without building on a preexisting high level of political conflict leaders and mass opinion would come to believe that their countries could prosper by impoverishing or even attacking others**. Is it possible that problems will not only become severe, but that people will entertain the thought that they have to be solved by war? While a pessimist could note that this argument does not appear as outlandish as it did before the financial crisis, **an optimist could reply (correctly, in my view) that the very fact that we have seen such a sharp economic down-turn without anyone suggesting that force of arms is the solution shows that even if bad times bring about greater economic conflict, it will not make war thinkable.**

Trade still happens- wars don't escalate

Lamy 11 (Pascal Lamy, Director-General of the World Trade Organization. Lamy is Honorary President of Paris-based think tank Notre Europe. Lamy graduated from the prestigious Sciences Po Paris, from HEC and ÉNA, graduating second in his year of those specializing in economics. "System Upgrade" BY PASCAL LAMY | APRIL 18, 2011)

The bigger test came with the 2008-2009 Great Recession, the first truly global recession since World War II. When the international economy went into free fall, trade went right along with it. Production and supply are today thoroughly global in nature, with most manufactured products made from parts and materials imported from many other countries. These global value chains have a multiplier effect on trade statistics, which explains why, as the global economy contracted by 2 percent in 2009, trade volume shrank by more than 12 percent. This multiplier effect works the other way around as well: **Growth returned to 4.6 percent** and trade volume grew by a record 14.5 percent over the course of 2010. **Projections for trade in 2011 are also strong, with WTO economists predicting that trade volume will rise 6.5 percent during the current year. This sharp rebound in trade has proved two essential things: Markets stayed open despite ever-stronger pressures to close them, and trade is an indispensible tool for economic recovery, particularly for developing countries, which are more dependent on trade. Shortly after the crisis broke out, we in the WTO began to closely monitor the trade policy response of our member governments. Many were fearful that pressures to impose trade restrictions would prove too powerful for governments to resist. But this is not what happened. Instead, the system of rules and disciplines, agreed to over 60 years of**

negotiations, held firm. In a series of reports prepared for WTO members and the G-20, we found that governments acted with great restraint. At no time did the trade-restrictive measures imposed cover more than 2 percent of world imports. Moreover**, the measures used** -- anti-dumping duties, safeguards, and countervailing duties to offset export or production subsidies **-- were those which, in the right circumstances, are permissible under WTO rules**. I am not suggesting that every safeguard measure or countervailing duty imposed during those difficult days was in compliance with WTO rules, but responses to trade pressures were generally undertaken within an internationally agreed-upon framework. **Countries** by and large **resisted** overtly **noncompliant measures**, such as breaking legally binding tariff ceilings or imposing import bans or quotas. As **markets stayed open, trade flows began to shift, and countries** that **shrugged off the impact** of the crisis and **continued to grow** -- notably China, India, and Brazil -- became ever-more attractive markets for countries that were struggling, including those in Europe and North America. Trade has been a powerful engine for growth in the developing world, a fact reflected in the far greater trade-to-GDP ratios we see there. In 2010, developing countries' share of world trade expanded to a record 45 percent, and this trend looks set to continue. Decisions made in Brasilia, Beijing, and New Delhi to open their respective economies to trade have been instrumental in enabling these countries to lift hundreds of millions of people out of poverty.

Collapse doesn't cause war- the upswing does

Ferguson 06 (Niall, Professor of History – Harvard University, Foreign Affairs, 85(5), September / October, Lexis)

Nor can economic crises explain the bloodshed. What may be the most familiar causal chain in modern historiography links the Great Depression to the rise of fascism and the outbreak of World War II. But that simple story leaves too much out. Nazi **Germany started** the **war** in Europe only **after its economy** had **recovered. Not all** the **countries affected by the Great Depression** were taken over by fascist regimes, nor did all such regimes **start wars of aggression**. In fact, **no general relationship between economics and conflict is discernible for the century as a whole. Some wars came after** periods of **growth**, others were the causes rather than the consequences of economic catastrophe, and **some severe economic crises were not followed by wars.**

no econ war empirics disprove war

Pickering 7 (Assistant Professor of Political Science at Kansas State University (Jeffrey, Emizet F. Kisangani, "Diverting with Benevolent Military Force: Reducing Risks and Rising above Strategic Behavior," International Studies Quarterly 51, 277–299, JSTOR)

Our results underscore the utility of broadening the conception of diversionary force and using the agenda setting framework to understand leaders' decisions to divert. As the agenda setting approach anticipates, we find that **leaders in democracies** and mixed regimes tend to **prefer a** comparatively **low-risk, low-profile type of military force when they attempt diversion.** They use what we term SEI in their attempt to clear the domestic policy agenda. **They** presumably **hope** that **the use of** such seemingly **controllable, low-scale force will provide a brief reprieve** from the public and the media's focus on issues that have damaged their political reputations and threatened their terms in office. If low politics force succeeds in providing leaders with the window they seek, they can be expected to do all they can to reshape the policy agenda in the hope of saving their political careers. **Autocratic leaders**, in contrast, **do not** appear to **use any**

form of external armed force to bolster their domestic standing **when they encounter** domestic unrest or **economic difficulty.** Our results also highlight the need for further theoretical development of the SCA framework. In our cross-national sample of democracies, SCA does not seem to constrain democratic leaders to the extent that is implied in the literature. For example, we find no evidence that SCA prevents democratic leaders from using PSI, and democratic leaders often used SEI even when SCA was present (see especially Table 5). The only time SCA seems to obstruct democratic leaders is when they attempt SEI in the face of rising levels of inflation or mass unrest. We did not expect target states to be able to employ SCA to inhibit SEI, but this result at least provides some evidence for the theoretically compelling and logical influence of SCA on democracies. This outcome and the unanticipated influence of SCA on autocracies suggest that the SCA framework requires greater precision. As noted previously, adding measures that capture extant relations or affinity levels among potential actors and targets may enhance the explanatory power of SCA. Another possibility is that we are trying to generalize a phenomenon that has limited scope. It may be that target states only worry about diversion from extremely powerful states and perhaps some unstable, unpredictable autocracies, which might explain why David Clark (2003) and Benjamin Fordham's (2005) results diverge from those found in this paper and by Christopher Sprecher and Karl DeRouen (2005). Careful empirical study will have to determine if this is the case, and if it is not why SCA appears to constrain certain types of actors experiencing certain types of domestic troubles but not others. Different methods will have to be used to pinpoint the prevalence and the impact of SCA. While powerful and suggestive, the ZIP method is based on a theoretical assumption: that SCA is the exogenous influence that prevents leaders from using military force. Although this is plausible and the evidence presented by David Clark (2003) and Benjamin Fordham (2005) is extremely compelling for the United States case, there could be other exogenous influences that have similar effects on leaders in other countries. Powerful **opposition parties** (Schultz 1998) **or increasing tensions** or instability **within the government** itself **could**, for example, tie leaders' hands in a way that **prevent**s **the use of military force.** Given the significant institutional variation that characterizes democracies and mixed regimes across the globe, both detailed qualitative and country-specific quantitative analyses will be necessary to trace the empirical boundaries of SCA and to refine the theory. In sum, this paper adds to the growing body of literature that suggests that **leaders** in democracies and mixed regimes **use armed forces** overseas **for diversionary purposes. It just may not be the** type of **high profile, confrontational military force we** typically **envision.** It is often armed force deployed over low politics issues like humanitarian suffering. Making **this** simple **distinction** between the types of armed force states use abroad **may go some way toward uniting extant empirical research on diversion** and perhaps even producing more cumulative research in the future.

Econ Resilient

Its 2013- proves *global economic resilient*- Sandy and EU prove

Eberly '13 (Jan Eberly, Assistant Secretary for Economic Policy for the Treasury Borrowing Advisory Committee of the Securities Industry and Financial Markets Association, "Statement by Assistant Secretary for Economic Policy Jan Eberly for the Treasury Borrowing Advisory Committee of the Securities Industry and Financial Markets Association", February 4, 2013)

WASHINGTON - Economic recovery in the U.S. continued at a moderate pace over the course of 2012, with real GDP expanding by 1.5 percent following a 2.6 percent increase during 2011. After thirteen straight quarters of growth, real GDP edged down slightly in the final quarter of last year, as sharply lower defense spending, slower inventory growth, and a widening of the trade deficit offset a solid increase in consumer spending and strong growth of both residential investment and business capital spending. **Job creation has accelerated in recent months. The unemployment rate declined notably** over the first nine months of 2012 and has been little changed since September. **The economy sustained a number of temporary shocks last year**, **such as a jump in energy prices early in 2012, a severe drought during the summer, and Hurricane Sandy in late October, and also contended with the ongoing sovereign debt crisis in Europe and a more general slowdown in global growth**. **Growth is expected to pick up in the first quarter of 2013, despite some fiscal drag**. **Other potential challenges this year include the risk of renewed setbacks in Europe, the impact of continued uncertainty about the U.S. fiscal situation, and the possibility of additional, sequester-related fiscal tightening. Even so, private forecasters anticipate a gradual acceleration in the pace of expansion as 2013 unfolds, as well as further progress in reducing unemployment.** According to the advance report released last week, real GDP edged down 0.1 percent at an annual rate in the fourth quarter, compared with a 3.1 percent advance in the third quarter. The swing was due in part to a 6.6 decline in government spending. Federal outlays fell 15.0 percent – the largest quarterly decline in four decades – as federal defense purchases plummeted 22.2 percent. In the third quarter, federal spending rose sharply, boosted by a jump in defense outlays. The composition of the pronounced swing between Q3 and Q4 suggests that uncertainty about the impending sequester played a role. State and local government spending, which has been falling nearly continuously since late 2009, declined 0.7 percent in Q4. Altogether, the decline in government expenditures cut 1¼ percentage points from real GDP growth in Q4. GDP growth in late 2012 was also held back by a sharp slowdown in private inventory accumulation, which subtracted 1¼ percentage points from real GDP in the fourth quarter after adding 0.7 percentage point to growth in the third quarter. The drought-related drawdown in farm inventories, which reduced GDP growth in the prior two quarters, slowed. A wider trade deficit subtracted an additional ¼ percentage point from GDP growth in the fourth quarter. Notwithstanding the slight dip in headline GDP, **the main components of underlying private demand strengthened in the fourth quarter. Consumer spending, which accounts for roughly two-thirds of GDP, grew by 2.2 percent at an annual rate,** accelerating from the third quarter's 1.6 percent rise, and adding 1.5 percentage points to real growth. Business fixed investment grew 8.4 percent in the fourth quarter, contributing 0.8 percentage point to growth. Equipment and software investment rose at a 12.4 percent pace after falling by 2.6 percent in the prior quarter. Residential investment grew by 15.3 percent at an annual rate in the fourth quarter, up from 13.5 percent in the third

quarter, and contributed 0.4 percentage point to GDP growth. **Residential investment has increased in each of the past seven quarters -- the first such string of advances in this sector since 2005** – and has grown at an average annual rate of almost 11 percent per quarter over this period. Private domestic final purchases (the sum of consumption, business fixed investment, and residential investment) jumped by 3.3 percent at an annual rate in the fourth quarter, more than double the third's quarter's 1.5 percent pace. **Over the past three years, this marker of a private-sector led, self-sustaining recovery has grown at an average annual rate of just under 3 percent.** Labor market conditions continue to improve at a steady but gradual pace, and the most recent data show that job creation at the end of 2012 was actually faster than initially reported. Private-sector job growth averaged 225,000 per month during the fourth quarter, up from 142,000 in the third quarter, and nearly double the 117,000 jobs per month created on average in the second quarter. More than 6.1 million new jobs have been created in the private sector since the employment trough in February 2010. Moreover, underlying labor demand appears to be improving. The average private-sector workweek stood at 34.4 hours in January, up from a low of 33.8 hours in 2009 and just 0.2 hour shorter than in December 2007. The unemployment rate stood at 7.9 percent in January, up slightly from a near four-year low of 7.8 percent in November and December. Measures of longer-term unemployment as well as marginal attachment to the labor force and part-time employment continue to trend lower. The median duration of unemployment fell by 4.8 weeks over the past year to 16.0 weeks in January and is down from a high of 24.8 weeks in mid-2010. It is worthwhile to look at progress across the country, too: in December, 25 states reported unemployment rates that were significantly below the national average. These are all positive signs that underlying labor market conditions continue to firm. **With the progress made in the housing market in the past several months, we now appear to be approaching important milestones**. For example, total housing starts rose in December to a 4½ year high and the number of residential building permits issued reached their highest level since mid-2008. As of December, total existing home sales had retraced to a level about two-thirds of their 2005 peak, and the decline in new single-family homes during that month was actually attributed to a lack of supply, rather than a dearth of demand – sales in this category were still up nearly 9 percent year-over-year. The inventory of unsold new homes is just above record lows for the series, which dates to the early 1960s, and the inventory of existing homes available for sale continues to move lower and is now two-thirds below its July 2010 peak level. **During 2012, residential investment climbed 14.4 percent** – the strongest yearly increase since 1983. **The major house price indexes have been moving higher on a year-over-year basis for the past ten months, and are now being supported by tighter supply and stronger demand conditions**. Record or near-record lows in mortgage rates, a relatively high level of housing affordability, and improving household wealth are also helping to boost demand and to support broader-based improvement in the housing sector. Looking ahead, downside risks to U.S. economic activity remain, including persistent concerns about instability in European sovereign debt markets. Here at home, consumer sentiment faltered at the turn of the year in the face of fiscal uncertainty and the expiration of tax cuts. Still, energy prices have eased in very recent months, and there are signs of reviving demand in Asia. **While downside risks create vulnerabilities in any economy, recent progress within the U.S. has improved the economy's resilience in the face of potential challenges**. **The underlying and consistent strength of private demand over the past three years constitutes an important foundation for that resilience,** and the level of real GDP is now 2.4 percent higher than in the fourth quarter of 2007, at the time of the previous expansion's peak. **After five years of decline, residential**

investment has added to growth in each of the past seven quarters. The workweek has lengthened to a duration close to that last seen in December 2007, the peak month of the previous upturn, and the unemployment rate is at a four-year low. These are important milestones for consumers as well as the housing and labor markets, and are evidence of a moderate and steady forward movement.

Econ resilient, US isn't key, and impact empirically denied

Lamy '11(Pascal Lamy is the Director-General of the World Trade Organization. Lamy is Honorary President of Paris-based think tank Notre Europe. Lamy graduated from the prestigious Sciences Po Paris, from HEC and ÉNA, graduating second in his year of those specializing in economics. "System Upgrade" BY PASCAL LAMY | APRIL 18, 2011)

The bigger test came with the 2008-2009 Great Recession, the first truly global recession since World War II. When the international economy went into free fall, trade went right along with it. Production and supply are today thoroughly global in nature, with most manufactured products made from parts and materials imported from many other countries. These global value chains have a multiplier effect on trade statistics, which explains why, as the global economy contracted by 2 percent in 2009, trade volume shrank by more than 12 percent. This multiplier effect works the other way around as well**: Growth returned to 4.6 percent** and trade volume grew by a record 14.5 percent over the course of 2010. **Projections for trade in 2011 are also strong, with WTO economists predicting that trade volume will rise 6.5 percent during the current year. This sharp rebound in trade has proved two essential things: Markets stayed open despite ever-stronger pressures to close them, and trade is an indispensible tool for economic recovery, particularly for developing countries, which are more dependent on trade. Shortly after the crisis broke out, we in the WTO began to closely monitor the trade policy response of our member governments. Many were fearful that pressures to impose trade restrictions would prove too powerful for governments to resist. But this is not what happened. Instead, the system of rules and disciplines, agreed to over 60 years of negotiations, held firm. In a series of reports prepared for WTO members and the G-20, we found that governments acted with great restraint**. At no time did the trade-restrictive measures imposed cover more than 2 percent of world imports. Moreover, **the measures used** -- anti-dumping duties, safeguards, and countervailing duties to offset export or production subsidies -- **were those which, in the right circumstances, are permissible under WTO rules**. I am not suggesting that every safeguard measure or countervailing duty imposed during those difficult days was in compliance with WTO rules, but responses to trade pressures were generally undertaken within an internationally agreed-upon framework. **Countries** by and large **resisted** overtly **noncompliant measures**, such as breaking legally binding tariff ceilings or imposing import bans or quotas. As **markets stayed open, trade flows began to shift, and countries** that shrugged off the impact of the crisis and **continued to grow -- notably China, India, and Brazil** -- **became ever-more attractive markets for countries that were struggling, including** those in Europe and **North America.** Trade has been a powerful engine for growth in the developing world, a fact reflected in the far greater trade-to-GDP ratios we see there. In 2010, developing countries' share of world trade expanded to a record 45 percent, and this trend looks set to continue. Decisions made in Brasilia, Beijing, and New Delhi to open their respective economies to trade have been instrumental in enabling these countries to lift hundreds of millions of people out of poverty.

Best studies prove

Brandt and Ulfelder '11 (*Patrick T. Brandt, Ph.D. in Political Science from Indiana University, is an Assistant Professor of Political Science in the School of Social Science at the University of Texas at Dallas. **Jay Ulfelder, Ph.D. in political science from Stanford University, is an American political scientist whose research interests include democratization, civil unrest, and violent conflict, April, 2011, "Economic Growth and Political Instability," Social Science Research Network)

These statements anticipating political fallout from the global economic crisis of 2008–2010 reflect a widely held view that economic growth has rapid and profound effects on countries' political stability. When economies grow at a healthy clip, citizens are presumed to be too busy and too content to engage in protest or rebellion, and governments are thought to be flush with revenues they can use to enhance their own stability by producing public goods or rewarding cronies, depending on the type of regime they inhabit. When growth slows, however, citizens and cronies alike are presumed to grow frustrated with their governments, and the leaders at the receiving end of that frustration are thought to lack the financial resources to respond effectively. The expected result is an increase in the risks of social unrest, civil war, coup attempts, and regime breakdown. Although it is pervasive, the assumption that countries' economic growth rates strongly affect their political stability **has not been subjected to** a great deal of careful **empirical analysis, and evidence from social science research** to date **does not** unambiguously **support it.** Theoretical models of civil wars, coups d'etat, and transitions to and from democracy often specify slow economic growth as an important cause or catalyst of those events, but empirical studies on the effects of economic growth on these phenomena have produced mixed results. Meanwhile, the effects of economic growth on the occurrence or incidence of social unrest seem to have **hardly** been **studied in recent years**, as empirical analysis of contentious collective action has concentrated on political opportunity structures and dynamics of protest and repression. This paper helps fill that gap by rigorously re-examining the effects of short-term variations in economic growth on the occurrence of several forms of political instability in countries worldwide over the past few decades. In this paper, we do not seek to develop and test new theories of political instability. Instead, we aim to subject a hypothesis common to many prior theories of political instability to more careful empirical scrutiny. The goal is to provide a detailed empirical characterization of the relationship between economic growth and political instability in a broad sense. In effect, we describe the conventional wisdom as seen in the data. We do so with statistical models that use smoothing splines and multiple lags to allow for nonlinear and dynamic effects from economic growth on political stability. We also do so with an instrumented measure of growth that explicitly accounts for endogeneity in the relationship between political instability and economic growth. To our knowledge, **ours is the first statistical study** of this relationship to simultaneously address the possibility of **nonlinearity and** problems of **endogeneity**. As such, we believe this paper offers what is probably the most rigorous general **evaluation** of this argument **to date**. As the results show, some of our findings are surprising. Consistent with conventional assumptions, we find that social unrest and civil violence are more likely to occur and democratic regimes are more susceptible to coup attempts around periods of slow economic growth. At the same time, our analysis shows no significant relationship between variation in growth and the risk of civil-war onset, and results from our analysis of regime changes contradict the widely accepted claim that economic crises cause transitions from autocracy to

democracy. While we would hardly pretend to have the last word on any of these relationships, our findings do suggest that the relationship between economic growth and political stability is **neither as uniform nor as strong as** the **conventional wisdom**(s) **presume**(s). We think **these findings** also help **explain why the** global **recession** of 2008–2010 **has failed** thus far to **produce** the wave of coups and regime failures that some observers had anticipated, in spite of the expected and apparent uptick in social **unrest** associated with the crisis.

(no econ collapse) economy's resilient – can survive shocks

Bloomberg 12 ("Fed's Plosser Says U.S. Economy Proving Resilient to Shocks," 5-9, http://www.bloomberg.com/news/2012-05-09/fed-s-plosser-says-u-s-economy-proving-resilient-to-shocks.html)

Philadelphia Federal Reserve Bank President Charles Plosser said the U.S. economy has proven "remarkably resilient" to shocks that can damage growth, **including surging oil prices and natural disasters**. "**The economy has now grown for 11 consecutive quarters**," Plosser said today according to remarks prepared for a speech at the Philadelphia Fed. "**Growth is not robust**. **But growth in the past year has continued despite significant risks and external and internal headwinds**." **Plosser**, who did not discuss his economic outlook or the future for monetary policy, **cited shocks to the economy** last year, **including the tsunami in Japan that disrupted global supply chains**, **Europe's credit crisis that has damaged the continent's banking system and political unrest in the Middle East and North Africa**. "**The U.S. economy has a history of being remarkably resilient**," said Plosser, who doesn't have a vote on policy this year. "These shocks held GDP growth to less than 1 percent in the first half of 2011, and many analysts were concerned that the economy was heading toward a double dip. Yet, the economy proved resilient and growth picked up in the second half of the year." Plosser spoke at a conference at the Philadelphia Fed titled, "Reinventing Older Communities: Building Resilient Cities." Urban Resilience His regional bank's research department is working on a project to measure the resilience of different cities, to learn more about the reasons that some urban areas suffer more than others in downturns, Plosser said. He mentioned one early finding of the study: Industrial diversity increases a city's resilience. "I do want to caution you that resilient and vibrant communities are not just about government programs or directed industrial planning by community leaders," Plosser said. "**The economic strength of our country is deeply rooted in our market- based economy and the dynamism and resilience of its citizenry**."

<u>U.S. Not Key</u>

Other countries check US growth

The Economist 07 (November 23, "America's Vulnerable Economy", pg. 13)

The best hope that **<u>global growth can stay strong lies instead with emerging economies</u>**. A decade ago, the thought that so much depended on these crisis-prone places would have been terrifying. Yet thanks largely to economic reforms, their annual growth rate has surged to around 7%. This year **<u>they will contribute half of the globe's GDP growth</u>**, measured at market exchange rates, **<u>over three times as much as America</u>**. In the past, **<u>emerging economies</u>** have often needed bailing out by the rich world. This time they **<u>could be the rescuers</u>**. Of course, a recession in America would reduce emerging economies' exports, but they are less vulnerable than they used to be. America's importance as an engine of global growth has been exaggerated. Since 2000 its share of world imports has dropped from 19% to 14%. Its vast current-account deficit has started to shrink, meaning that **<u>America is no longer pulling along the rest of the world</u>**. Yet **<u>growth in emerging economies has quickened,</u>** partly thanks to demand at home. In the first half of this year the increase in consumer spending (in actual dollar terms) in China and India added more to global GDP growth than that in America. Most emerging economies are in healthier shape than ever (see article). They are no longer financially dependent on the rest of the world, but have large foreign-exchange reserves—no less than three-quarters of the global total. Though there are some notable exceptions, most of them have small budget deficits (another change from the past), so they can boost spending to offset weaker exports if need be.

Economic Collapse Inevitable

Economic Collapse is inevitable

Smith 6/20(John Smith, Degrees in Journalism and History, 6/20/14, "New Survey States Economic Collapse is 99.9% Unavoidable in 2014," Us Finance Post, http://usfinancepost.com/new-survey-states-economic-collapse-is-99-9-unavoidable-in-2014-20184.html**, Accessed 7/11/14, MX)**

Global risks are accelerated: everyone is in a historic transition that few will be able to recover from, says The Wall Street Journal **The crisis ahead will be worse than 2000 and 2008** states the new Wall Street Journal survey that summarized the views of financial leaders who were interviewed over the last year. **The** underlying **reason is** simple: "**a monetary policy that is fundamentally flawed" – the Federal Reserve System is still "printing cheap money".** "The Feds should stop micromanaging the economy, which includes debt buybacks and investing in private companies," urged David Stockman, director of the Office of Management and Budget of the U.S. between 1981 and 1985. Meanwhile, William Hunt **Gross, founder of PIMCO**, one of the largest global asset managers of the fixed income investment world, **warned of "supernova credits."** He explained that **his company has two billion dollars at risk if cheap money from the Federal Reserve explodes.** "Investment banking a decade ago only promoted the development of small business, but it is now being dominated by leveraged speculation," Gross said. **The world is caught in a mega-bubble** that has no name and **analysts warned** the Federal Reserve that **the bubble "is about to explode, as did the Asian financial crisis years ago."** The paper, which focuses on data, research, and tips from financial advisors, warned that millions of investors have no idea what will happen**. Sooner or later there will be "another ugly battle" related to debt and the markets will be "crippled". Gary Shilling**, columnist for Forbes, **warned of an expanding bubble. He calculated a very slow real GDP growth for the next eight years of only 2%, and promised an even more serious global slowdown over the next generation. "I am 100% sure that the crises that we are moving towards will be much worse than 2008," he said.**

Tradeoff DA

<u>1NC</u>

Funding for Cassini is low now; if NASA funding were reduced the program could be eliminated.

Rehnberg, 2014 (Morgan Rehberg; a graduate student in the University of Colorado - Boulder's Department of Astrophysics and Planetary Science, @ work he studies the rings of Saturn and develop software to help detect near-Earth asteroids; "COULD THE 2014 BUDGET SAVE CASSINI?"; 1/15/14; http://cosmicchatter.org/news/2014/1/15/could-the-2014-budget-save-cassini; Date Accessed: 7/12/14)

<u>**With its future on the line**</u>, the <u>**Cassini mission may**</u> yet <u>**survive if the US Congress passes their proposed budget**</u> for 2014. And, for once, that's not seeming like such a big if. It's been a long road for NASA's Cassini spacecraft. In development starting in the mid 1980s and launched towards Saturn in 1997, the mission didn't arrive at its destination until the summer of 2004. Designed for a four year mission upon reaching Saturn, <u>**the Cassini program has been extended**</u> twice - first for two years until 2010, and then for a final seven through 2017. Coming up on ten years in <u>**Saturnian orbit**</u>, Cassini <u>**has revolutionized our understanding of the planet and the enigmatic rings which surround it. Despit**</u>e its <u>**incredible successes, recent rumors have suggested that Cassini could be on the chopping block**</u>. Budget shortfalls at NASA, exacerbated by sequestration, has NASA facing a Sophie's Choice: shut down the successful Cassini or eliminate the popular Curiosity. Cassini and Curiosity represent NASA's two active "flagship" missions (I'm ignoring Voyager here). These are the largest and most expensive (more than $2 billion each) missions undertaken by the space agency and are major commitments to studying Saturn and Mars, respectively. In addition to their upfront price tag, each costs in the neighborhood of 50-60 million dollars a year to operate, significantly more than smaller missions. Although in theory NASA could choose to eliminate either one, it's extremely difficult to imagine shutting down the recently-launched Curiosity, especially given its tremendous public popularity. So<u>**, things were not looking great for Cassini, but the 2014 budget might offer some relief.The current draft of the 2014 federal budget includes an additional $700 million for NASA over last year's appropriation. That's an increase of about 4%. More importantly, the NASA science office received a larger proportion of that, about 7%, and planetary science in particular is being boosted about 10%.**</u>

The Aff spends a lot of money and funding for Space and Sea exploration is zero-sum.

Mangu-Ward, 2013 (Katherine Mangu-Ward; managing editor of Reason magazine and a Future Tense fellow at the New America Foundation; "Is the Ocean the Real Final Frontier?"; 9/4/13;http://www.slate.com/articles/technology/future_tense/2013/09/sea_vs_space_which_is_the_real_final_frontier.html; Date Accessed: 7/12/14)

While many of the technologies for space and sky are the similar, right down to the goofy suits with bubble heads—the main difference is that in space, you're looking to keep pressure inside your vehicle and underwater you're looking to keep pressure out—<u>**there's often a sense that that sea and space are competitors rather than compadres.**</u>

They needn't be, says Guillermo Söhnlein, a man who straddles both realms. Söhnlein is a serial space entrepreneur and the founder of the Space Angels Network. (Disclosure: My husband's a

member.) The network funds startups aimed for the stars, but his most recent venture is Blue Marble Exploration, which organizes expeditions in manned submersibles to exotic underwater locales. (Further disclosure: I have made a very small investment in Blue Marble, but am fiscally neutral in the sea vs. space fight, since I have a similar amount riding on a space company, Planetary Resources.) As usual**, the fight** probably **comes down to money**. **The typical American believes that NASA is eating up a significant portion of the federal budget** (one 2007 poll found that respondents pinned that figure at one-quarter of the federal budget), but the space agency is actually nibbling at a Jenny Craig–sized portion of the pie. **At about $17 billion, government-funded space exploration accounts for about 0.5 percent of the federal budget**. **The National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration—NASA's soggy counterpart—gets much less, a bit more than $5 billion for a portfolio that, as the name suggests, is more diverse.** But the way Söhnlein tells the story**, this zero sum mind-set is the result of a relatively recent historical quirk**: For most of the history of human exploration, private funding was the order of the day. Even some of the most famous examples of state-backed exploration—Christopher Columbus' long petitioning of Ferdinand and Isabella of Spain, for instance, or Sir Edmund Hillary's quest to climb to the top of Everest—were actually funded primarily by private investors or nonprofits. But that changed with **the Cold War**, when **the race to the moon was fueled by government money and gushers of defense spending wound up channeled into submarine development and other oceangoing tech.** "**That** does **lead to an either/or mentality. That federal money is taxpayer money which has to be accounted for, and it is a finite pool that you have to draw from against competing needs,** against health care, science, welfare," says Söhnlein. "In the last 10 to 15 years, we are seeing a renaissance of private finding of exploration ventures. On the space side we call it New Space, on the ocean side we have similar ventures." And the austerity of the current moment doesn't hurt. "The private sector is stepping up as public falls down. We're really returning to the way it always was."

Cutting NASA's budget harms the economy and the US's STEM leadership.

Vertesi, 2013 (Janet Vertesi; sociologist of science and technology at Princeton University; "Don't gut NASA space missions"; 10/14/13; http://www.cnn.com/2013/12/14/opinion/vertesi-cassini-mission/; Date Accessed: 7/13/14)

Next year's **NASA budget is poised to force premature cancellation of either Curiosity or Cassini -- the agency's flagship missions**. Funding decisions get made behind closed doors, but **projected figures reduce Cassini's budget in 2014 by almost half, and half again in 2015, making it impossible to fly.** Even **funding for analyzing data will be "restructured," according to NASA. These cuts are not only devastating for scientists; they are also** potentially **harmful for our economy, and our leadership in STEM (Science, Technology, Engineering and Math).** When most people think of spacecraft, they think of hunks of metal flying or driving around, alone in the far reaches of the solar system. Some are cute and personable, like the Opportunity Rover or Voyager; some, like Cassini, are less well known. People might also recall the gorgeous photos spread across the front pages of the New York Times or on the cover of National Geographic. A few might even think of the famous scientists who have brought these pictures to life, like Carl Sagan, Steve Squyres, or Carolyn Porco. The robots' stories and adventures captivate us. But what about the people who created and operate the robots? Behind the scenes, largely invisible to the public, are many of America's best scientists and engineers at the Jet Propulsion Laboratory, NASA centers, and research facilities who work on these missions to make space exploration possible. The **budget cuts will affect America's most experienced and**

most promising engineers and researchers. They may have to join the legions of the unemployed. Do we really want to put someone like Bobak Ferdowksi, NASA's famous "Mohawk Guy," out of a job?

Some may think that space engineers can simply move to the private sector. After all, companies like Space X or Virgin Galactic are looking for talents. **But private ventures involve different motives and skills. And private companies do not fund planetary science and experiments. Moreover, private and public research institutions** from Cornell to Ohio State University **rely partly on NASA grants to support their graduate students, post-docs, and other staff in STEM fields.** In other words**, NASA funding** not only **expands the frontiers of our knowledge**, it also **trains the next generation of STEM leaders in our country**. **The budget cuts would deprive our young scientists and engineers the resources to continue their studies and, in turn, contribute to America's innovation.** Seen in perspective, **the looming budget adjustment along with all the cuts in recent years sentences America's planetary exploration program to death by starvation.** Cassini, for one, is already operating on a shoestring. And NASA has put plans for future missions to the outer solar system on ice, despite efforts by the planetary community to plan cost-effective and exciting opportunities. **The continuous gutting of NASA** and its planetary science programs **should outrage all Americans**. If we end the Cassini or the Curiosity mission, **it would be a crisis** not just for science but for America's leadership in STEM. At a time when our math and science students are getting left behind, and the public is looking to our high tech and scientific sectors to power innovation and economic growth, we should invest in our sciences and continue to inspire the next generation. Let's make sure our current best and brightest working on the cutting edge don't get the pink slip.

With out Stem Leadership, the word faces a laundry list of threats including climate change, energy and water shortages, public health emergencies, environmental degradation, poverty, and food insecurity

Fedoroff, 2008 (Nina V. Fedoroff; received the National Medal of Science, President of the American Association for the Advancement of Science, a member of the United States National Academy of Sciences, the American Academy of Arts and Sciences, the European Academy of Sciences, and the American Academy of Microbiology; "HEARING: BEFORE THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON RESEARCH ANDSCIENCE EDUCATION COMMITTEE ON SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGYHOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES ONE HUNDRED TENTH CONGRESSSECOND SESSION"; 4/2/2008; http://www.gpo.gov/fdsys/pkg/CHRG-110hhrg41470/html/CHRG-110hhrg41470.htm; Date Accessed: 7/13/14)

Chairman Baird, Ranking Member Ehlers, and distinguished members of the Subcommittee, thank you for this opportunity to discuss science diplomacy at the U.S. Department of State. The U.S. is recognized globally for its leadership in science and technology. Our **scientific strength is both a tool of ``soft power''**--part of our strategic diplomatic arsenal--**and a basis for creating partnerships with countries** as they move beyond basic economic and social development. Science diplomacy is a central element of the Secretary's transformational diplomacy initiative, because **science and technology are essential to achieving stability and strengthening** failed and fragile states. **S&T advances have immediate and enormous influence on national and global economies**, and thus on the international relations between societies. **Nation states**, nongovernmental organizations, and multinational corporations **are largely shaped by their expertise in and access to intellectual and physical capital in science, technology, and engineerin**g. Even as S&T advances of our modern era provide opportunities for economic

prosperity, some also challenge the relative position of countries in the world order, and influence our social institutions and principles. **America must remain at the forefront of this new world by maintaining its technological edge, and leading the way internationally through science diplomacy and engagement**. Science by its nature facilitates diplomacy because it strengthens political relationships, embodies powerful ideals, and creates opportunities for all. **The global scientific community embrace**s principles Americans cherish: **transparency, meritocracy, accountability, the objective evaluation of evidence, and broad and frequently democratic participation**. Science is inherently democratic, respecting evidence and truth above all. Science is also a common global language, able to bridge deep political and religious divides. Scientists share a common language. Scientific interactions serve to keep open lines of communication and cultural understanding. As scientists everywhere have a common evidentiary external reference system, **members of ideologically divergent societies can** use the common language of science to cooperatively **address both domestic and the increasingly trans-national and global problems confronting humanity in the 21st century**. There is a growing recognition that **science and technology will increasingly drive** the successful **economies of the 21st century.** Science and technology provide an immeasurable benefit to the U.S. by bringing scientists and students here, especially from developing countries, where they see democracy in action, make friends in the international scientific community, become familiar with American technology, **and contribute to the U.S. and global economy**. For example, in 2005, over 50 percent of physical science and engineering graduate students and postdoctoral researchers trained in the U.S. have been foreign nationals. Moreover, many foreign-born scientists who were educated and have worked in the U.S. eventually progress in their careers to hold influential positions in ministries and institutions both in this country and in their home countries. They also contribute to U.S. scientific and technologic development: According to the National Science Board's 2008 Science and Engineering Indicators, 47 percent of full-time doctoral science and engineering faculty in U.S. research institutions were foreign-born. Finally, some types of science--particularly those that address the grand challenges in science and technology--are inherently international in scope and collaborative by necessity. The ITER Project, an international fusion research and development collaboration, is a product of the thaw in superpower relations between Soviet President Mikhail Gorbachev and U.S. President Ronald Reagan. This reactor will harness the power of nuclear fusion as a possible new and viable energy source by bringing a star to Earth. ITER serves as a symbol of international scientific cooperation among key scientific leaders in the developed and developing world--Japan, Korea, China, E.U., India, Russia, and United States--representing 70 percent of the world's current population. The recent elimination of funding for FY08 U.S. contributions to the ITER project comes at an inopportune time as the Agreement on the Establishment of the ITER International Fusion Energy Organization for the Joint Implementation of the ITER Project had entered into force only on October 2007. **The elimination of** the promised **U.S. contribution drew our allies to question our commitment and credibility in international cooperative ventures**. More problematically, **it jeopardizes a platform for reaffirming U.S. relations with key states**. It should be noted that **even at the height of the cold war, the United States used science diplomacy as a means to maintain communications and avoid misunderstanding between the world's two nuclear powers**--the Soviet Union and the United States. **In a complex multi-polar world, relations are more challenging, the threats perhaps greater, and the need for engagement more paramount. The welfare and stability of countries and regions in many parts of the globe require a concerted effort by the** developed **world to address the causal factors** that render countries fragile and cause states to fail. Countries that are unable to defend their people against starvation, or fail to provide economic opportunity, are susceptible to

extremist ideologies, autocratic rule, and abuses of human rights. As well, **the world faces common threats, among them climate change, energy and water shortages, public health emergencies, environmental degradation, poverty, food insecurity**, and religious extremism. **These threats can undermine the national security of the United States,** both directly and indirectly. Many are blind to political boundaries, becoming regional or global threats. The United States has no monopoly on knowledge in a globalizing world and the scientific challenges facing humankind are enormous. **Addressing these common challenges demands common solutions and necessitates scientific cooperation**, common standards, and common goals. We must increasingly harness the power of American ingenuity in science and technology through strong partnerships with the science community in both academia and the private sector, in the U.S. and abroad among our allies, to advance U.S. interests in foreign policy.

UQ

Funding for Cassini is happening now

Leone, 2014 (Dan Leone; he NASA reporter for SpaceNews, where he also covers other civilian-run U.S. government space programs and a growing number of entrepreneurial space companies, In his previous job, Dan was a technology and business reporter for Transport Topics, a Washington-based weekly newspaper covering the trucking and surface transportation industries, earned a bachelor's degree in public communications from the American University in Washington; “Cashed Strapped NASA Chose Cassini over SOFIA”; http://www.spacenews.com/article/civil-space/39739cashed-strapped-nasa-chose-cassini-over-sofia; Date Accessed: 7/13/14)

WASHINGTON — **An international airborne telescope** the White House proposed mothballing March 4 **was squeezed out of NASA’s budget by** other ongoing missions, in particular the flagship-class **Cassini probe that has been orbiting Saturn since 2004**, a senior agency official said. **The White House proposed grounding** the billion-dollar **Stratospheric Observatory for Infrared Astronomy (SOFIA) in part to avoid forcing the 16-year-old Cassini orbiter to compete with the 1.5-year-old Mars Curiosity rover** for extended mission funding, according to budget documents. **Cassini needs about $60 million a year to reach its currently targeted mission conclusion in September 2017.**

Space funding now

Dreier, 2014 (Casey Drier; Director of Advocacy- leads the strategic planning and implementation of the Society's political advocacy efforts, has a B.A. in Physics from Oberlin College, a regular contributor to The Planetary Report; “Congress Rejects Cuts to Planetary Exploration…Again”; http://www.planetary.org/press-room/releases/2014/congress-rejects-cuts.html; Date Accessed: 7/13/14)

The FY2014 Omnibus spending bill, now before the U.S. Congress, **once again rejects cuts to NASA's Planetary Science Division** that were sought by the White House. The Planetary Society commends Congress for this action, and strongly encourages the White House to prioritize Planetary Science in its future budget requests commensurate with its strong public and legislative support. The Society supports the passage of this bill for its additional Planetary Science funding as well as its overall funding levels allocated for NASA.

Congress plans to allocate $1.345 billion for NASA's Planetary Science Division, $127 million more than requested by the White House. We strongly support the increase, but note that the number is well below the program's historical average of $1.5 billion per year.

The additional funding ensures the steady development of the next major mission to Mars in 2020, which will store samples of the red planet for eventual return to Earth. It also provides $80 million for continued research into a flagship-class mission to explore Europa, the enigmatic moon of Jupiter that was recently revealed to be spouting its liquid-water ocean into space.

"Exploring Europa **is no longer a 'should' but a 'must',**" said Casey Dreier, The Planetary Society's Director of Advocacy, "Congress made a smart decision to continue studying the Europa Clipper mission concept. **There is bipartisan support and strong public interest** in exploring Europa, the mission is technically feasible, and it is high priority within the scientific community. The White House should embrace this bold search for life and request a new start for this mission in FY2015."

Cassini has avoided a decrease in funding thus far, but the brink is now.

Howell, 2014 (Elizabeth Howell; a senior writer at Universe Today and regular contributor to Space.com, Space Exploration Network, the NASA Lunar Science Institute, NASA Astrobiology Magazine and LiveScience, pursuing a Ph.D. in aerospace sciences at the University of North Dakota; "BUDGET 2015: Flying SOFIA Telescope To Be Shelved For 'Higher-Priority' Programs Like Cassini"; 3/4/2014; http://www.universetoday.com/110007/budget-2015-flying-sofia-telescope-to-be-shelved-for-higher-priority-programs-like-cassini/#ixzz312pqDlgD; Date Accessed: 7/12/14)

NASA is prepared to axe an airborne telescope to keep "higher-priority" programs such as the Saturn Cassini mission going, according to budget documents the agency released today (March 4). We have more information about the budget below the jump, including the rationale for why **NASA is looking to shelve its Stratospheric Observatory for Infrared Astronomy (SOFIA).**

NASA's has been flying the telescope for just over three years and recently took some nice snapsnots of the M82 supernova that astronomers have been eager to image. **The agency's administrator, however, said SOFIA has had its shot and it's time to reallocate the money for other programs.**

Cassini is in jeopardy, spending cuts would reduce affectivity.

Foust, 2014 (Jeff Foust; aerospace analyst, journalist and publisher. A senior aerospace analyst with the Futron Corporation, the editor and publisher of The Space Review and has written for Astronomy Now and The New Atlantis, has a bachelor's degree in geophysics from the California Institute of Technology and a Ph.D in planetary sciences from the Massachusetts Institute of Technology; "NASA: upcoming senior review won't pit Cassini versus Curiosity"; 1/17/14; http://www.spacepolitics.com/2014/01/17/nasa-upcoming-senior-review-wont-pit-cassini-versus-curiosity/; Date Accessed: 7/12/14)

Last week, a senior NASA official denied that was the case. "That's inaccurate," said Jim Green, director of NASA's planetary science division, at a meeting last week of the Small Bodies Assessment Group (SBAG) in Washington when asked about reports that only one of those two flagship missions could be continued. That review will involve some "tough decisions," he acknowledged, but that does not mean shutting off missions entirely. "I'd rather not do that to any of the planetary missions," he said. "**Some missions may be funded at a higher level than other missions**" based on priorities established in the senior review. Green offered a similar message earlier this week to another group of scientists, the Outer Planets Assessment Group (OPAG), meeting in Tucson. Other scientific divisions at NASA, notably heliophysics, deals with

such reviews by ending some missions entirely, a process Green said he'd like to avoid. "Each and every one of those [**planetary] missions may not be funded at the current level that are funded at right now," he said. "Some may be at a lower level."** That environment, Green said, means that ongoing missions will need to be creative in figuring out how to continue their missions, or some aspects of them, for less than they're receiving today. "It's a very tough environment, so everyone needs to sharpen their pencils and really think about the science that can be accomplished," he said at OPAG. The process of the senior review itself is still coming together, with one big uncertainty: how much money will be available for continuing missions. Bill Knopf, lead program executive for mission operations in the planetary sciences division at NASA Headquarters, told OPAG that a "guideline narrative" for the senior review will be released to projects by the end of this month. Those guidelines, though, will not include budget levels, which will wait until the release of the administration's fiscal year 2015 budget proposal, not expected until at least late February. Proposals from the various missions will be due in April, with results announced in June. We're working on not as much information as we'd like to have right now," Knopf said, referring to the unknown level of the fiscal year 2015 budget. "Hopefully, the President will issue his budget in February." Those statements by NASA officials, though, may not be completely reassuring to scientists. The reliance on the FY2015 budget proposal for setting spending levels for the senior review could be problematic, as the administration sought significant cuts in planetary spending in both its FY13 and FY14 budget proposals, cuts partially offset by Congress in the final spending bills for those years. In a statement earlier this week about the final FY14 appropriations bill**, Rep. Adam Schiff (D-CA) said he heard "disquieting rumors" about cuts in the planetary science program in the FY15 proposal, including "shutting down some current missions**." Those involved in **Cassini**—**which continues to be perceived as the mission most in jeopardy** during the senior review, **given its cost and age**—made the case for continuing the mission at OPAG. "**Cassini is an investment not to be wasted," Linda Spilker, Cassini project scientist, said in a presentation to OPAG**. Flying the mission though its planned end in September 2017 would cost about $180 million, or $60 million a year, and perform science that otherwise could likely not be accomplished for decades. "**To waste it would be unthinkable." Cassini,** some believe**, could also be at a disadvantage if asked to continue the mission with reduced funding, since it has already had to tighten its belt during past reviews**: Spilker said **Cassini's budget went from $80 million to $60 million a year in the previous senior review in 2012 even though it was considered fully funded.** Those kinds of challenges await NASA and ongoing planetary missions this year. "The cold reality," said Knopf, "is that we have only so much money to go around."

Links

Space Exploration has more funding than ocean exploration now.

Casti, 2013 (Taylor Casti; Master's student in Publishing: Digital and Print Media at New York University; "Ocean vs. Space: Which Is the True Final Frontier?"; 9/25/13; http://mashable.com/2013/09/25/ocean-vs-space/; Date Accessed: 7/12/14)

Space may be called "the final frontier," but anyone who has seen a picture of a goblin shark or a vampire squid will agree that the ocean can be downright alien. **Both realms are ripe for exploration, offer extensive potential benefits and come at a hefty price.** So **which wins in a battle between the two for the title of the final frontier**? Which area of exploration will result in the greater good for humanity? Dr. Paul Bunje, senior director of prize development and ocean health at the XPRIZE Foundation, and Alexandra Hall, senior director of Google Lunar XPRIZE, met on the Social Good Summit stage to duke it out on Tuesday. **Space has been the clear leader for a long time. $17.8 billion dollars is going toward space exploration in 2013, compared to the $5 billion dollars that goes toward oceanic exploration.** This discrepancy has led to skewed results: **While 500 individuals have been sent into space, only three have visited the deepest part of the ocean**, the Mariana Trench. **We have better maps of the surface of Mars than we do of our own ocean floor, and we understand more about the dark side of the moon than ocean life. Despite centuries of ocean exploration, we've only covered about 5% of the ocean.**

There's a trade off – NASA receives funds out of the same committee that funds NOAA

Mervis, 2010 (Jeffrey Mervis; deputy news editor, Science Magazine, American Association for the Advancement of Science, Washington, D.C.; "President Obama's Science Spending"; transcript of an interview with various guests on NPR; 2/5/10; http://www.wbur.org/npr/123410020/president-obamas-science-spending; Date Accessed: 7/12/14)

But more broadly, Congress isn't going to go for all of these things. **Congress**, as you'll talk about later with NASA, **is not going to be happy with that reallocation and savings**. And **the reason that's important to the rest of the science budget is because NASA is funded by the same committee that funds the National Science Foundation, the Environmental Protection Agency, the Department of Commerce, which has NOAA and NIST**. And so if they have a fixed amount of money**, the more they give to one agency, the less there is for everybody else**. So sometimes **Congress makes decisions** not because they're opposed to research, but **because they have other higher priorities.**

There's a trade off- budgeting is zero-sum

Williams, 2011 (Jesse Williams; guest columnist for Yale Daily News; "Williams: War of the wars"; 1/20/11; http://yaledailynews.com/blog/2011/01/20/williams-war-of-the-wars/; Date Accessed: 7/12/14)

The budget-tightening weeks are a tough time in Washington. After all, our **revenues are finite, so budgeting is a zero-sum game: every dollar we spend on education is a dollar we can't**

spend on the military; every dime we put into Social Security is one dime that can't go to NASA, and so on. So when it comes time to cut, **every portion of spending can, in a very real sense, be evaluated against any other portion.** Yet, we rarely do that kind of broad evaluating — we stay busy trying to decide whether we're giving the Marine Corps a new tank instead of a new jet. That's not a conversation about national priorities, and not the kind of conversation we can and should be having. Why not weigh that tank against, say, $12 billion in federal subsidies for education?

Cut-Go Rules cause a trade-off

Sange, 2011 (Alexandra Sange; a Public Policy Associate at the National Association of Community Health Centers, works to preserve, strengthen and expand Community Health Centers through the federal legislative process with a focus on health center reimbursement and financing. She works with Congress on health centers' priorities in Medicaid, Medicare, CHIP, and other insurance plans, capital financing, health information technology, and 340B, and other mandatory spending, has a Masters in Public Policy; "HOUSE PASSES NEW RULES FOR THE 112TH CONGRESS"; 1/18/11; http://blogs.nachc.com/washington/house-passes-new-rules-for-the-112th-congress/; Date Accessed: 7/12/14)

Changing Pay-go to Cut-go. The new rules replace the previous 'pay-as-you-go' or PAYGO requirement with a 'cut-as-you-go' or cut-go requirement. **Cut-go prohibits the House from considering any bill that produces a net increase in mandatory spending within the 1-year, 5-year and 10-year budget windows,** as opposed to PAYGO's ten-year window**. If a bill increases mandatory spending by any amount, the bill must cut the budget somewhere by that same amount**. Under PAYGO, spending cuts could serve as offsets to spending increases, however, revenue **increases could also serve as offsets**. **Under the 'cut-go' rule increases in revenue cannot be used to offset increases in mandatory spending.**

Impact

Key to Science Leadership

Funding is key to science

Spudis 2014 (Paul is a senior staff scientist at the Lunar and Planetary Institute in Houston, AIR AND SPACE MAGAZINE: published by the Smithsonian, April 22, "NASA's Extended Science Missions in Peril", http://www.airspacemag.com/daily-planet/nasas-extended-science-missions-peril-180951189/?no-ist accessed 5/1/2014)

But when is enough, enough? There are so many places to go, so much to do and so little money to spread around; new missions are waiting their turn. Once a mission completes its defined job, shouldn't we accept that it's over and move on to the next one? What reasoning guides NASA's continued support for extended missions?¶ There are several strong arguments in favor of continuing extended missions. The most obvious one is that an **extended mission takes advantage of a proven asset already in place and working**. **Spaceflight remains a risky business** and it's amazing that after 50 years of experience with it, seemingly minor malfunctions or glitches can and do destroy the well-laid plans, work and dreams of hundreds of scientists and engineers. Every launch of a spacecraft is a heart-stopping moment for the people who have worked (often for years) on the mission – a hope against hope that somehow, their "baby" will survive this baptism of fire and safely navigate the treacherous shoals of interplanetary space. **Most malfunctions occur early in flight**, either in launch failures or during the deployment of structures, such as antennas and solar arrays. **With those early events safely behind them, the mission team can breathe easier and begin data collection**.¶ Once the nominal mission data is "in the can," the mission team has safely cleared another hurdle and eagerly looks forward to the collection of additional data. In some cases, spacecraft are flexible enough to be programmed to collect data or conduct experiments that were not thought about prior to flight. In other cases, spacecraft designed to collect partial data for a planet can end up collecting global data sets, or at least greatly improve an existing data product through repeated additional observations. In the 1970s, the Viking Orbiters had imaging systems much improved over the previous Mariner 9 camera, but the mission was not designed to make a global map of Mars. Nonetheless, the Viking Orbiters ended up mapping the entire planet in unprecedented resolution and image quality during their extended missions.¶ Another reason for continuing an extended mission is if there are no immediate plans for any future missions to the object of study. For example, **the Cassini mission has been extended repeatedly not only for the excellent science it is producing, but also because no future missions to Saturn are currently planned by any space faring nation**. In the case of LRO, it is the last remnant of what was to be a series (now cancelled) of robotic missions to the Moon. Moreover, the LRO spacecraft is in a stable "frozen" orbit that requires no maintenance; its instruments continue to work superbly and we are conducting new and innovative experiments, such as using the large radio dish antenna at Arecibo (Puerto Rico) to undertake "bistatic" radar measurements of various locales and geological units, including most interestingly, polar deposits. Bistatic radar measurements of diffuse backscatter can distinguish between those caused by rocky surfaces and ice; this particular experiment was not planned when LRO was launched five years ago. We have obtained new data that portrays a moon unlike the one we thought it to be. This "new" Moon is drawing the attention of the world's space powers.¶ The camera on LRO constantly returns detailed, high-resolution images of astonishing beauty and utility. We have completely mapped the Moon at medium resolution (about 100 meters per pixel); the Narrow Angle Camera on LRO can resolve objects on the surface as small as one meter (pixel size 25-100 cm). These data have given us spectacular views of fresh flows of impact melt (twisted landforms caused by the flow of liquid, shock-melted rock), entrances to subterranean (sublunarian?) voids (possibly intact lava caves), unusual and enigmatic landforms that may be created by recent and violent venting of gas from the lunar interior, and newly formed impact craters, known to be new because previous images show nothing at these sites. Virtually all of these features were completely unknown prior to being imaged by the LROC. Thus, ongoing extended missions can and often do make new and unexpected discoveries, in some cases discoveries that could not even have been anticipated prior to flight.¶ At a recent meeting, NASA Administrator Charles Bolden claimed that extending old missions was "not as invigorating" for young scientists than starting new ones. Nothing could be further from the truth. **Most students in planetary science and space engineering cut their teeth by working on extended missions**. Students and young investigators get few opportunities to work directly on new missions – most mission teams are made up of experienced scientists and engineers (read: greybeards). **It is only during the extended mission that the less experienced people get their chance** ("It's done its job – let the kids play with it!"). Moreover, for ongoing missions like LRO, student workers are a critical and large part of the team for ongoing operations. They plan data collects, monitor the downlinks and store and archive the data. The loss of an extended mission asset doesn't increase opportunities for students – it decreases them.¶ We do not yet know how the Senior Review will turn out. NASA is famous for wanting to "move on" to the next thing and often abandons working spacecraft**. A bird in the hand is worth two in the bush but as things currently stand, there isn't much in the mission pipeline to move on to**. Planetary Science has taken several massive budgetary hits in the past few years, with more on the way.¶ The termination of LRO and MER will not help move new missions off the drawing board. **Money not spent on these extended**

missions will probably slide into SMD's **Black Hole of Funding** (the James Webb Space Telescope) or be dissipated on new paperwork, committee meetings and concept studies. It would be both fiscally prudent and programmatically responsible for NASA to fund and retain these working and still productive extended missions.

<u>Science Leadership Good—Laundry List</u>

Science diplomacy is key to solve all of the major problems of the 21st century

Fedoroff 2009 - Science and Technology Adviser to the Secretary of State and to the Administrator of the U.S. Agency for International Development (USAID), U.S. Department of State, Washington DC 20520, USA. (Nina, "Science Diplomacy in the 21st Century", 1/9/2009, http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S009286740801636X#)

But **<u>the problems are deep and stubborn.</u>** Perhaps the most poignant disparities exist between the countries of the developed world and much of Africa, where climate, disease, soil exhaustion, and a host of other problems contribute. In his book titled "The Bottom Billion," economist Paul Collier (http://users.ox.ac. uk/~econpco/) offers an insightful analysis of the many factors that contribute to trapping the poorest nations in continuing cycles of poverty and unrest. **<u>The global food crisis of 2008 triggered food riots in more than 30 countries and calls for a new Green Revolution. The first Green Revolution, however, was relatively straightforward, if not easy: improved crop varieties and increased fertilizer use. The next Green Revolution will be more difficult, even if we succeed in overcoming the deep and widespread mistrust of using modern molecular methods for the genetic improvement of crop plants.</u>** In a crowded world, we no longer have the luxury of focusing on the single variable of agricultural productivity. **<u>Food, water, energy, health, and economic development are all intertwined. Progress will depend on a high level of education, particularly in science and engineering. All will be impacted by climate change and politics—everywhere. Climate change is a wake-up call to the awareness that we live in a world without borders.</u>** Airplanes can make SARS and multidrug-resistant TB everyone's problem in a heartbeat. **<u>Trade barriers between nations and farm subsidies in developed nations stifle agricultural growth in developing countries.</u>** The rush toward renewable energy from biofuels accelerates deforestation in the Amazon, however indirectly, and with each acre lost, another multitude of species goes extinct. Wall Street's problems echo around the world**<u>. And all of these seemingly separate problems turn out to be interconnected.</u>** Food and energy are now viewed as fungible. Growing the food—and feed and fiber and fuel—demanded by a still expanding and increasingly affluent human population requires innovations not just in agricultural productivity but also in water and land management, food processing, and transportation. Decimating what remains of the tropic's forests will as surely exacerbate climate change as it will reduce biodiversity. **<u>It's one big thorny tangle: people, money, food, energy, health, water, land, climate, biodiversity. How do we as scientists begin to think—and act—on a global scale to address such complicated problems? It seems to me that we must first become citizens not just of our own nations, but of this world without borders.</u>** We need to see, experience, and identify with the peoples and the problems of other nations and to recognize the complexity and interconnections among the challenges facing 21st century humanity. And perhaps most importantly of all, we need to understand, at a deep gut level, that all our fates are truly intertwined. **<u>We must move quickly to develop the science that will allow us to model and understand the complex system that is our planet and its crust of human activities.</u>** We need to invent efficient, nonpolluting means of local power generation. We need to invest in the research that will allow us to improve how we manage water, grow food, battle disease, and build economies into the next generation—and the next. **<u>Science, of course, provides the common language to build bridges between cultures.</u>**

A2: Tradeoff DA

Link Level

No NASA Cuts

Budget cuts won't affect NASA's programs.

Bodzash, 2011 (Dennis Bodzash; astronomer/astrophotographer, serves as a member of the Board of Directors and as newsletter editor for Northeast Ohio's Black River Astronomical Society, writes columns as Cleveland Photography and Astronomy Examiner; "Last-ditch effort to avoid government shutdown involves NASA cuts"; http://www.examiner.com/article/last-ditch-effort-to-avoid-government-shutdown-involves-nasa-cuts; Date Accessed: 7/13/14)

Ever since the space race ended with Apollo 11, **NASA has found itself on the chopping block** as only science, not national pride, has been at stake**. Since NASA's budget (as a part of the total federal budget) peaked in the mid 1960s, NASA has been operating under less and less money relative to the government as a whole**. However, **even as its relative budget has shrank, NASA has always found ways to probe the mysteries of the cosmos. No doubt, regardless of what the next government spending bill offers, NASA will continue on its quest.**

NASA funding inevitable

Coren, 2013 (Courtney Coren; contributor to NewsMax.com; Budget Restraints Could Delay or Abort Major NASA Projects; http://www.newsmax.com/SciTech/nasa-budget-cassini-hubble/2013/12/26/id/543841/#ixzz32AfvBova; Date Accessed: 7/13/14)

For example, the **Cassini spacecraft currently orbiting Saturn will run out of fuel in about four years. To continue that mission, now focused on exploring Saturn's rings, it would take about $60 million a year**, according to The Washington Post. But **the NASA budget presently has no funding designated for the mission,** which could bring it to an early end next year. "**I think it would be the height of folly to terminate such a profoundly successful mission when we're not done yet**," **said** Carolyn **Porco, planetary scientist at the Space Science Institute** in Boulder, Colo. Porco works on the project. **NASA officials believe the administration and Congress will likely share that view and in the end will allow the mission to continue with the appropriate funding**.

Funding Inevitable-Despite requested budget cuts, NASA funding continues to occur

Dreier, 2014 (Casey Drier; Director of Advocacy- leads the strategic planning and implementation of the Society's political advocacy efforts, has a B.A. in Physics from Oberlin College, a regular contributor to The Planetary Report; "Congress Rejects Cuts to Planetary Exploration…Again"; http://www.planetary.org/press-room/releases/2014/congress-rejects-cuts.html; Date Accessed: 7/13/14)

The Society also supports the congressional recommendation that NASA increase the pace of small planetary missions. We are particularly happy to see full congressional and White House support for restarting the nation's Plutonium-238 production capability, which provides electrical power for many planetary science missions that can't utilize solar panels. **The White House has requested cuts to planetary science for two years in a row, and for two years in a row Congress has rejected them**. In light of this and the more than 50,000 messages sent to Congress and President Obama in support of NASA's planetary science program last year, we

urge the Office of Management and Budget to recognize the unprecedented public and legislative support for solar system exploration, and propose $1.5 billion for this program in their FY2015 budget request.

No Tradeoff

The plan is new spending – PAYGO doesn't guarantee trade-offs

Riedl 2005 (Brian, Grover M. Hermann fellow in federal budgetary affairs at Heritage, January 25, http://www.heritage.org/research/reports/2005/01/whats-wrong-with-the-federal-budget-process)

The budget process is designed with a bias toward higher spending and taxes. Public choice theory recognizes that how democracies make decisions has a substantial effect on what is decided. Multi-year constraints, such as PAYGO and discretionary spending caps, represent an attempt by policymakers with a long-term view to constrain the decisions of annual budgeters who are focused only on the short term. However, these multi-year **constraints fail to settle the question of whether the budget process should be used to limit spending** (as discretionary caps suggest) or to slow the growth of the budget deficit, regardless of government size (as PAYGO suggests). This confusion created odd situations whereby **even policies that would** achieve both goals of **reduc**ing **spending and** reducing **the budget deficit** (such as a discretionary spending cut accompanied by a smaller tax cut) have not been allowed. Furthermore, **PAYGO did not successfully blunt the pro-spending bias of annual budget writers** because it focused only on the effects of new policies and ignored current policies-because it was rarely enforced. Public choice theorists also note the pro-spending bias caused by the decentralization of spending committees. Although a single appropriations committee in the House and the Senate annually approves all discretionary spending, nearly a dozen different committees in each body of Congress write mandatory spending programs. The lack of coordination between these committees creates a "tragedy of the commons," whereby **each committee is responsible only for the funding of its own pet programs with no obligation to trade off their costs with the costs of other committees' programs**.[3] Accordingly, **each committee over-prioritizes and consequently over-funds its own programs.** A single committee reviewing all legislation would solve this bias by taking on the responsibility to make the difficult trade-offs.[4]

Any tradeoffs would come from other budgets

SVITAK 11 (3/29. Amy; Senior Writer – Space.com, "NASA's Budget Could Get Infusion From Other U.S. Departments," http://www.space.com/11247-nasa-budget-funding-commerce-justice-departments.html, 2011, RZ)

Congressional appropriators could tap the funding accounts of the U.S. departments of **Commerce and Justice to** help **cover** what some see as a $1 billion **shortfall in NASA's** $18.7 billion **spending plan** for 2012, which allocates less money for a heavy-lift rocket and crew capsule than Congress directed last year. "There's over a billion-dollar difference between the budget request and the authorized levels in [20]12 for the launch system and the crew vehicle, and now that falls squarely back on the shoulders of [the appropriations committees] to try and figure out where to come up with that money," said a panelist at a March 23 breakfast on Capitol Hill. Sponsored by Women in Aerospace (WIA), the breakfast was held under the Chatham House Rule, an 84-year-old protocol fashioned by the London-based nonprofit think-tank to promote frank discussion through anonymity. [What Obama and Congress Should Do for Spaceflight] The panelist, one of six whose names and job titles were circulated by WIA prior to the meeting, said funding requested in NASA's 2012 spending plan does not square with levels Congress set in the NASA Authorization Act of 2010 that U.S. President Barack Obama signed into law in October. Specifically, the request called for spending $1.2 billion less than the $4 billion Congress authorized for the heavy-lift launch vehicle and crew capsule in 2012. At the same time, the request includes $350 million more than the $500 million Congress authorized to nurture development of commercial vehicles to deliver cargo and crews to the International Space Station after the space shuttle retires later this year. Consequently, the panelist said, **it is** now **up to congressional appropriators** "to find a billion dollars in other places in NASA to pay for those activities or to decide **to make those tradeoffs and take that money out of the**

departments of Commerce or Justice or the other agencies that are funded in the same bill as NASA." NASA's annual appropriation is part of a broader spending package totaling nearly $65 billion **that funds the U.S. Commerce and Justice departments, the National Science Foundation, the National Institute of Standards and Technology and related agencies**. But with NASA and other federal agencies operating in a fiscally constrained environment, the panelist said Congress could struggle to fund new multibillion-dollar programs next year. "It's not impossible but the ability to do that is severely constrained in the environment we're working in now, and that's exacerbated by budget requests coming up from the administration that don't track with the authorization," the panelist said. Congress has yet to pass an appropriations bill for 2011, leaving NASA and most federal agencies to subsist at 2010 spending levels in the current budget year. The panelist said passing spending legislation for NASA "is a complicated and challenging thing this year, and it will be again next year" given a fiscal climate that has changed dramatically authorized funding levels for the space agency were set last fall. However, the panelist said the appropriations subcommittees that fund NASA are "very supportive of the agency, they're supportive of the authorization, they want to see NASA get as close as possible to those authorized levels, so that will be a work in progress."

Internal Link Level

<u>A2: Cuts Kill NASA</u>

Cuts don't get kill programs – NASA will find a way to fund everything

Bodzash 11 (Dennis, writer @ Space News Examiner, http://www.examiner.com/space-news-in-national/last-ditch-effort-to-avoid-government-shutdown-involves-nasa-cuts) JPG

Ever since the space race ended with Apollo 11, **<u>NASA has found itself on the chopping block as only science</u>**, not national pride, **<u>has been at stake</u>**. Since NASA's budget (as a part of the total federal budget) peaked in the mid 1960s, **<u>NASA has been operating under less and less money</u>** relative to the government as a whole. However, **<u>even as its relative budget has shrank, NASA has always found ways to probe the mysteries of the cosmos</u>**. No doubt, **<u>regardless of what the next government spending bill offers, NASA will continue on its quest.</u>**

Impact Level

No Impact

Scientists lack unity, and are ineffective at engaging governments, means no solvency

National Research Council 12 The National Research Council (NRC) is the working arm of the United States National Academies, which produces reports that shape policies, inform public opinion, and advance the pursuit of science, engineering, and medicine. ("U.S. and International Perspectives on Global Science Policy and Science" [pgs.33-34]—2012 http://www.nap.edu/openbook.php?record_id=13300&page=33 KW)

Many workshop participants **underlined the failure of scientists to effectively engage policy makers** and the public **in** the **understanding the role of science and its** potential **value in diplomacy and** in **development.** According to Volker ter Meulen, **the main challenges are the lack of a unified voice to speak on behalf of science and the lack of experience within the political institutions** to use science and effectively communicate with the science community. This challenge is often compounded by the multiplicity of other voices in a crowded world. **In a very complicated diplomatic system**, involving NGOs, intergovernmental organizations, media, and new communication modes and networks, **the scientific community must learn how to** inform and **engage more effectively with** all these groups and **governments**. Furthermore, several participants underscored the importance or recognizing that many of the major policy challenges require science in diplomacy across a broad front. For example, tackling the Millennium Development Goals requires understanding and action on food, health, and the environment, which involves multiple government departments and requires a coherent and integrated policy. **Unfortunately,** noted one discussant, **there are often organizational barriers within and between governments, in addition to the low public understanding and support for such policies.**

Lack of cohesion, human capital, and infrastructure prevent effective science diplomacy

National Research Council 12 The National Research Council (NRC) is the working arm of the United States National Academies, which produces reports that shape policies, inform public opinion, and advance the pursuit of science, engineering, and medicine. ("U.S. and International Perspectives on Global Science Policy and Science" [pgs.33-34]—2012 http://www.nap.edu/openbook.php?record_id=13300&page=33)

A serious **lack of human capital, coherent national science** and technology **strategies, and research infrastructures in** potentially **partnering countries was identified** by some workshop participants **as an important barrier to** more **effective international engagement.** Gebisa Ejeta and others stated that **weak human capacity**, in part owing to brain drain, **and the lack of adequate research infrastructure in** developing **countries has too often derailed promising science-based developments** or worse, prevented their successful exploitation. **Ejeta also underlined the differences in goals and aspirations between** institutions in **the United States and** those in developing **countries** that often **create an awkward dialogue about the objectives of** collaborative **partnerships.** Most of the advanced research institutions in the developed world aim at creating a global public good; in contrast, research centers in most developing countries focus on the development of locally needed products and services. Nevertheless, he believed that the two goals are mutually supportive, and if the parties communicate and work together, a win-win scenario often can be reached. He also noted an overreliance in developing countries on external funding to capitalize on science diplomacy and global science cooperation

opportunities, which is, of course, largely because of insufficient local resource commitment to science. There is a shortage of functional research centers and science support architecture such as science and technology commissions merit-based funding mechanism, or science academics in the developing world. Several participants identified building such structures as an important goal of science diplomacy.